CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

I.S.B.N.

THESES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (r. 82/08)

Canada

186

0-315-12499-7

National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Division
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Division des thèses canadiennes

60410

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

- Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

DENNIS WILLIAM STOKES

Date of Birth — Date de naissance MARCH 4, 1932	Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance ENGLAND

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

9 ROYAL ROAD
EDMONTON, ALBERTA,
T6J 2E7

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

DETERMINANTS OF SOCIAL CONTACT IN URBAN — SMALL TOWN SETTINGS: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF LEDUC AND EDMONTON, ALBERTA.

University — Université

ALBERTA

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

PhD

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade 1982	Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse DR. L.W. KENNEDY

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date OCTOBER 8, 1982	Signature D.W. Stokes

NL-91 (4/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

DETERMINANTS OF SOCIAL CONTACT IN URBAN--SMALL TOWN SETTINGS: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF LEDUC AND EDMONTON, ALBERTA.

by

© DENNIS W. STOKES

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1982

POPULATION RESEARCH LABORATORY
TEL. (403) 432-4659, 432-5797

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, CANADA T6G 2H4

October 1, 1982

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

I have given Dennis Stokes permission to use the 1977 Edmonton Area Study data in his Ph.D. thesis.

Sincerely,

L.W. Kennedy

L.W. Kennedy
Director

LWK:th

Micro

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR DENNIS W. STOKES

TITLE OF THESIS DETERMINANTS OF SOCIAL CONTACT IN URBAN--SMALL TOWN SETTINGS: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF LEDUC AND EDMONTON, ALBERTA.

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED FALL, 1982

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(SIGNED) D.W. Stokes

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

9 Royal Road,
Edmonton, Alberta,
T6J 2E7

DATED September 10 1982

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled DETERMINANTS OF SOCIAL CONTACT IN URBAN--SMALL TOWN SETTINGS: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF LEDUC AND EDMONTON, ALBERTA. submitted by DENNIS W. STOKES in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

Leslie W Kennedy
Supervisor

Raymond Currie
External Examiner

Date September 10, 1982

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on ascertaining the determinants of social contact in urban, suburban, and small town settings. The major theorist in this area of research is identified as Wirth. His "Theory of Urbanism" (1938) is predicated on the effects and interaction of population size, density, and heterogeneity of people living in cities. His behavioral postulates are extensively analyzed. Three forms of social contact and their postulated consequences are identified.

Criteria for adequate testing of Wirth's (1938) postulates are introduced and discussed. Empirical tests of his behavioral postulates which meet these criteria are examined. The results are equivocal. Other studies which specifically cite Wirth (1938) but do not meet these criteria are reviewed. Their results are inconclusive. It is concluded that Wirth's (1938) behavioral postulates had not been adequately tested.

The narrow focus of Wirth's (1938) theory and the inconclusive empirical evidence led to the determination of six theoretical models. These models provide a wider focus to search for determinants of social contact. The models are used as a screening device to review empirical research on four types of social contact; organizational membership, neighboring, socializing with relatives, and socializing with friends.

Some empirical support is found for all of the models, except one, under all four types of social contact.

The models are operationalized using data from two existing studies. The 1977 Edmonton Area Study was directed by the Population Research Laboratory, Department of Sociology, University of Alberta. The 1977 Leduc Area Study was directed by the author for Preventive Social Services for the Town of Leduc.

The models are tested using multiple regression analysis. Different findings are unique to each type of social contact. A limited amount of commonality among the models is observed with organizational membership and neighboring. The unique differences in the findings, however, are overshadowed by the small amounts of variance explained, in particular, the result in socializing with relatives. The implications of the findings for theory and empirical research are discussed in the conclusion. Recommendations are made for further research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people, personally and professionally, contribute to the training of a graduate student. It has been my good fortune to receive some of the best. In particular, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Leslie Kennedy. He has been a constant friend and mentor throughout my studies. I am very grateful for all his advice and support.

The help freely given over the years by the members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Earle Snider, Dr. Wayne McVey, and Dr. Denis Johnson, is greatly appreciated. Thanks are also extended to Dr. Raymond Currie of the University of Manitoba for his valuable contribution as external advisor.

A special note of thanks is extended to friends, Dr. Judith Golec, Harvey Krahn, and Dr. Barrie Robinson, who contributed particular help and moral support.

Finally, an enormous debt of gratitude is owed to wife Mary, son John, and daughter Elizabeth, for their tangible sacrifices and their unique contribution. This study would not have been completed without their support.

Table of Contents

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

The Problem 1

Background of the Problem 2

Purpose and Significance of Study 8

Steps in the Research Procedure 9

Data and Limitations 10

Plan of the Thesis 10

II. THEORETICAL FOCUS OF WIRTH 12

Criteria for Testing Wirth 22

Summary 24

III. EMPIRICAL TESTS OF WIRTH 26

Introduction 26

Empirical Tests of Wirth 26

Other Empirical Tests of Wirth 28

Other Theoretical Problems 31

Summary 37

IV. THE THEORETICAL FOCUS OF SUBURBAN RESEARCH 39

Introduction 39

The Theoretical Models 39

Summary 50

V. REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON SOCIAL CONTACT 52

Introduction 52

The Review 52

ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP 55

Model 1, Social Homogeneity. 56
Model 2, Environmental Choice. 57
Model 4, Personal Characteristics. 58
Model 5, Distance Effects. 63
Model 6, Contextual Effects. 65
NEIGHBORING 67
Model 1, Social Homogeneity. 68
Model 2, Environmental Choice. 68
Model 3, Urbanism. 69
Model 4, Personal Characteristics. 69
Model 5, Distance Effects. 75
Model 6, Contextual Effects. 77
SOCIALIZING WITH KIN 80
Model 1, Social Homogeneity. 80
Model 2, Environmental Choice. 81
Model 4, Personal Characteristics. 82
Model 5, Distance Effects. 87
Model 6, Contextual Effects. 89
SOCIALIZING WITH FRIENDS 91
Model 1, Social Homogeneity. 91
Model 2, Environmental Choice. 92
Model 3, Urbanism. 93
Model 4, Personal Characteristics. 93
Model 5, Distance Effects. 97
Model 6, Contextual Effects. 98
Summary of Models by Type of Social Contact 100

Summary of Models across Types of Social Contact 101

VI. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 104

Introduction 104

Sample Selection 105

Sampling Procedure 106

Data Collection 107

Dependent Variables 107

Independent Variables 109

Methods of Analysis 118

Regression Analysis 119

Summary 124

VII. THE PEOPLE, THEIR LOCATION AND ITS EFFECTS 126

Introduction 126

The Locations 126

Population Characteristics 128

Summary 131

THE EFFECTS OF LOCATION 132

Introduction 132

The Effects of Location 132

Conclusion 141

VIII. THE DETERMINANTS OF SOCIAL CONTACT 143

Introduction 143

Organizational Membership 145

Neighboring 149

Social Evening with Relatives 153

Social Evening with Friends 156

Summary of Results by Type of Social

Contact 160

Summary of Results Collectively 162

IX. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 165

Summary 165

Conclusion 174

Implications of the Results for Empirical Research 176

Implications of Results for Theory 176

Implications of Theory for Society 181

Recommendations 183

REFERENCES 187

APPENDIX A 202

APPENDIX B 205

APPENDIX C 209

APPENDIX D 212

APPENDIX E 214

APPENDIX F 233

APPENDIX G 235

LIST OF TABLES

Table Description Page

2.1 Postulated Direct Effects of Size, Density, and Heterogeneity 17

2.2 Postulated Direct Effects of Increasing Urbanism 19

3.1 Variables Correlated with Social Contact when Testing Wirth 29

6.1 Variables Commonly Associated with Social Contact 110

6.2 Variables Specific to a Particular Social Contact 113

6.3 Variables to be Tested 114

7.1 Selected Demographic Characteristics by Location 129

7.2 Locational Differences for Organizational Membership 133

7.3 Locational Differences for Neighborhood Adults Known 134

7.4 Locational Differences for Chatting with Neighbors 135

7.5 Locational Differences for Social Evening with Relatives 136

7.6 Locational Differences for Social Evening with Friends 137

7.7 Comparison of Variance Explained by Location on Selected Dependent Variables.....140

8.1 Increase in Explained Variance for Selected Models on Organizational Membership by Location..145

8.2 Increase in Explained Variance for Selected Models on Neighboring by Location.............149

8.3 Increase in Explained Variance for Selected Models on Social Evening with Relatives by Location 154

8.4 Increase in Explained Variance for Selected Models on Social Evening with Friends by Location..157

9.1 Significant Models and Cumulative Variance for Selected Types of Social Contact by Location..171

I. INTRODUCTION

The Problem

The subject of this thesis is empirical research on social contact in urban, suburban, and small town settings and what conclusions may be drawn therefrom. Researchers have assumed that urbanism and industrialism have negative effects on the quality and strength of different forms of social contact. This has led to a large body of empirical research. The lack of systematic empirical testing combined with the elimination of hypotheses resulted in a proliferation of theoretical models and considerable disagreement about the characteristics of social contact in modern society. Thus, after over fifty years of sociological endeavour, it is not possible to definitively identify the determinants of specific forms of social contact in urban--suburban settings.

Hence, the first purpose of this thesis is to critically examine the pertinent theoretical literature on forms of social contact and identify the theoretical models. The theoretical models will be used as an organizing device to condense, disentangle, and bring order to the mass of empirical literature and, if possible, draw conclusions about it. The second purpose of the thesis is to empirically test the theoretical models. The models will be operationalized with variables identified in the empirical literature. The strongest significant model will be identified by testing the models simultaneously in one set of data. Conclusions will be drawn about the characteristics and determinants of social contact in urban, suburban, and small town settings.

Background of the Problem

As Giddings (1897) correctly noted, sociology has focused on socialization since its inception as a discipline because it was regarded as the binding agent of the fabric of society. For example, Simmel (1950) and Toennies (1957[1897]) have argued that without socialization society would break down in various ways ultimately leading to undesirable impersonal, rational social relations. Without social contact, socialization cannot occur. Its pivotal role in society is reflected in the enormous body of theoretical and empirical literature in the discipline.

Social contact was described by Giddings (1897:4) when he detailed the ways in which people are socialized. They grow from birth to adulthood, and make social contact through family, school, peers, voluntary organizations, and friends. Social contact was further delineated by Cooley (1913:23-24). It consists of primary group relations characterized by intimate, face-to-face association and cooperation. The most important universal groups are the family, the play group of children, and the neighborhood group. These are "fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual." They are primary (Cooley, 1913:26-27) "in the sense that they give the individual his earliest and completest experience of social unity." They are (Cooley,1913:27) "springs of life . . . for social institutions."

Cooley (1913:26) also identified voluntary associations, clubs, and fraternal societies as primary groups in North America. They are based on congeniality and often originate through school or work.

Earlier in time, from a different perspective, Simmel (1950[1903]) attributed decreased meaningful social relations in the city to the presence of large concentrations of people. A similar theme was elaborated by Park at the University of Chicago in his prescription for investigating urban behavior. Park stated (1925:23-24) that secondary, indirect social relations in the city "have been" substituted for primary relations. He also attributed the disintegration of social institutions such as church and school to urban life.

Under the leadership of Park during the 1920's and 1930's, his prescription for investigating urban behavior was the central focus of enquiry in the community case studies (e.g.Lynd,1956[1929], Warner and Lunt,1941). The community studies focused on social organization in parts of Chicago and elsewhere (Bell and Newby,1971:92). These studies assumed that the levels of organizational membership, in terms of the numbers of persons belonging or in terms of the frequency of members attending, was indicative of the lack of social integration in the city.

This negative view of the effects of city life was given its strongest and most influential statement by Wirth (1938), who trained at the University of Chicago.

The theoretical focus, presented by Wirth (1938), argued that urbanism has negative effects on certain types of social contact. The comprehensiveness of his theory ensured its survival as a source of debate to the present day. But its focus on the negative effects of urbanism failed to account for the extent of social contact observed in urban society. In fact, according to Tomeh (1967:85):

> One of the major criticisms of Wirth and others of the Chicago school is that they exaggerated the degree of secularization and disorganization that supposedly typifies urban communities.

In time, a limited number of researchers directly tested the dependent measures of social contact in Wirth's (1938) theory. Their results were inconclusive. This led other researchers to test the wider question of the nature and determinants of social contact in urban-suburban settings. The latter research indicated that social contact and social interaction were major contributors to the urban-suburban social system (Tomeh,1967:85).

Incomplete testing of Wirth's (1938) theory and the empirical research which demonstrated positive social attributes of the city led to considerable theoretical debate (e.g.Fischer,1973;Curson and Bester,1972) regarding the current relevance of Wirth's (1938) formulation. Alternative, empirically-based formulations were produced which attempted to reflect the expanded horizon of urban research. These six models consist of uniquely specified formulations of determinants of forms of social contact. They were originated independently by different authors who were selectively assessing the results of empirical studies of social contact. As they are specified separately, the models may not be further reduced. Amalgamating them in any way would be methodologically unwarranted without first testing them separately. The models are identified by a model number and title and are described below. The six models have been placed in order according to the numbers of independent variables identified beginning with the smallest number and proceeding to the largest.

Model 1, Social Homogeneity, was first described by Gans (1968). Based on a re-evaluation of the current relevance of Wirth's (1938) theory and in light of the expansion of the city into suburbs, Gans concluded (1968:45) that if people are free to choose to participate in socializing, they would do so on the basis of social class and stage in the family life cycle. Marshall (1973:126) also specified this model as one of three ways to differentiate life style between city and suburb.

Model 2, Environmental Choice, was delineated by Michelson (1970). He maintains (1970:19,24) that individual responses to city life have to be measured in terms of the balance or congruence between individual characteristics, values, and the physical and social environment. The choices that people make (Michelson,1970:62-63) are governed by their life style based on their economic, ethnic, and life cycle stages. Model 2 builds on Model 1 by adding variables associated with the physical environment, values, and perceptions.

Model 3, Urbanism, was formulated by Fischer (1975:1319-1323) as an alternative model. It encompasses parts of Models 1 and 2. Fischer (1975:1321-1323) argues that both Model 1, Social Homogeneity, and Model 2, Environmental Choice, ignore the independent effects of population size and density. Instead, urbanism based on population size affects social life in the city by strengthening subcultures based on ethnicity, religion, or occupation. In essence, Fischer (1975) argues that under Model 3, Urbanism, social contact and interaction will increase with population concentration and the presence of subcultures.

Under Model 4, Personal Characteristics, levels of social contact between city and suburban residents vary by personal characteristics which affect individual life styles in a given location. This model is derived from two sources, Marshall (1973) and Fischer and Jackson (1976). Both sources included variables associated with social class and stages in the family life cycle. In addition, in his version, Marshall included (1973:127-133) commuting, density, patterns of leisure, sex, religious participation, and home ownership. Fischer and Jackson (1976:279,291,299) operationalized their version using ethnicity, religion, length of residence, house type, number of cars, and wife works.

Model 5, Distance Effects, is also derived from two sources, Marshall (1973) and Fischer and Jackson (1976). Marshall (1973:133-137) maintains that social contact increases with distance from the Central Business District (CBD) due to selective migration. To test this effect, Model 1, Social Homogeneity, and Model 4, Personal Characteristics, have to be controlled. For Fischer and Jackson (1976:279-280), however, Model 5, Distance Effects, is a result of peripheral location in the suburbs encouraging a social focus in the area. It operates irrespective of personal and structural variables.

Model 6, Contextual Variables, is, in effect, a socially deterministic model. The social characteristics of a place cause newcomers to socialize in certain ways. The model has been variously operationalized. Its proponents, Fischer and Jackson (1976) use two contextual measures, proportion of youth and average income in the census tract.

Thus, it may be argued that, in one sense, an incompletely tested but stronger theory of urbanism (Wirth,1938) competes with six conceptual models and a large body of rather disparate empirical research. Hence, it is not yet possible today to unequivocally identify, theoretically or empirically, which variables are common or specific to various types of social contact.

Purpose and Significance of Study

Accordingly, it is the intention of this thesis to critically examine the theoretical literature and identify conceptual models therefrom. The models will be used as an organizing device to conduct an analysis of the empirical literature on social contact. The results of this analysis will assist in operationalizing the models to complete the final step of the analysis. The final step will identify the determinants of different types of social contact in urban settings through a comprehensive analysis of current data. The importance of this work rests with the fact that the direct effects of Wirth's (1938) theory and the above-noted models have not been tested comprehensively at one time in a single context of inquiry.

The significance of this endeavor rests with the fact that such a systematic and thorough analysis has yet to be done. In particular, it will systematically differentiate types of social contact. This will ultimately lead to an understanding of the phenomenon in terms of its potential for socialization and its pivotal role in society.

As the focus of the present research is an effort to disentangle the relevant determinants of social contact, three bodies of literature fall outside the scope of the analysis and will, therefore, be ommitted from the literature review. These are studies of community, social networks, and social support.

Steps in the Research Procedure

The steps in the research procedure are as follows:

1. An exploration of the theoretical perspective of Wirth (1938). It will focus on the context of his theory, how it was interpreted, how it was empirically tested, and what conclusions may be drawn therefrom.
2. A review of later theoretical developments as they pertain to modern urban society leading to the development of theoretical models.
3. Selection of empirical literature which specifically examines the determinants of various forms of social contact. The literature is selected through bibliographic search, references, and reviews of the literature.
4. Application of the theoretical models as a screening device to impose order on the empirical literature. Conclusions will be drawn about the merits of each model in terms of findings which support it. Comparisons cannot be made about the relative merits of the models until they are all tested at one time.
5. Discussion of methodological problems associated with testing the models in an existing data set. Independent and dependent variables will be discussed and their relevance considered. Appropriate statistical techniques will be selected according to the nature of the tasks to be performed.
6. The data will be analyzed to produce models which are

statistically significant from testing all the models simultaneously.

7. Implications of the findings and suggestions for future research will conclude the procedure.

Data and Limitations

The data to be used in this study are taken from two studies completed in 1977: the Edmonton Area Study (Kennedy et al, 1977:6) and the Leduc Area Study sponsored by the town's Preventive Social Services Program. Almost all of the variables discussed in the empirical literature are available in these two studies with a few exceptions noted later (Chapter VI). The available range of variables will enable complete operationalization of the models for testing at one time. As these studies were completed for another purpose, however, they do not contain a rural sample that otherwise would have been collected. As Guterman (1969) has argued, a complete test of urban effects cannot be made if the comparative variable has no rural component. A view which seems to be more prevalent, however, is that the rural component is no longer relevant given the dominance of urban places over rural surrounds. With no resolution of this dilemma at hand, it should be kept in mind throughout the study.

Plan of the Thesis

The next chapter examines Wirth's (1938) Theory of Urbanism and other relevant aspects of social contact theory. Specific empirical tests of Wirth are reviewed in Chapter III. Six theoretical models derived from the theoretical focus of urban, suburban, small town research are delineated and discussed in Chapter IV. These six models are used to systematically review empirical research on socal contact in Chapter V. Following a discussion of methodological issues derived from the literature and anticipated in this thesis in Chapter VI, the population and locations under study are discussed in terms of their relevant characteristics in the first part of Chapter VII. The effects of location on social contact are analyzed in the remainder. The results of testing the models are discussed in Chapter VIII. Conclusions and implications of the findings are discussed in the final chapter.

II. THEORETICAL FOCUS OF WIRTH

Wirth's (1938) "Theory of Urbanism" contained in his article "Urbanism as a Way of Life" has been acknowledged by many (e.g. Fischer,1976;Axelrod,1951) as the central theory positing the effects of urbanism (in this case) on social contact. The ideas it contains, however, largely originate with Simmel. He was concerned (1950[1903]:409- 424) in "The Metropolis and the Mental Life" with the psychological effects of increasing concentrations of people in cities.

Simmel argued (1950:410-422) that the increased social contact resulting from this population concentration would cause the "metropolitan man" to react with "his head instead of his heart" leading to a "matter of fact" and "blase attitude". This development was reflected at the societal level by the proliferation of special purpose voluntary associations with less formal membership criteria. At the level of the individual, it was epitomized in the ascent of the "objective spirit" over the subjective resulting "essentially from the growing division of labor." In effect, Simmel was positing increased rationalization of the individual and society based on a turning away from meaningful relationships.

The most influential articulation of the position enumerated by Simmel was presented by Wirth (1938) in his "Theory of Urbanism." In it, Wirth developed the implications of the effects of urban life on the individual to an even greater extreme.

Wirth (1938:3-22) used the city and the country as two poles representing ideal types of communities labelled "urban-industrial" and "rural-folk society" between which "all human settlements tend to arrange themselves." A city was defined as "a relatively large, dense, and permanent settlement of socially heterogeneous individuals." Wirth attributed (1938:22) var consequences as a result of the effects and interaction of the size of the population, its density, and heterogeneity. Among these he included behavioural consequences (social contact, organizational membership, or socializing) and subjective consequences (quality of relationships, social distance, reserve, instability, or insecurity). But, as Fischer (1972) has noted, Wirth's journalistic style of discourse needs distilling if one is to evaluate the theory.

Fischer (1972) used Wirth's (1938) theory as the basis of a dynamic model to test the effects of population size on a number of social psychologically based variables. These included (1972:190) "nervous stimulation, isolation, anomie, alienation," and hence, are somewhat problematic to operationalize.

In reviewing Wirth (1938) in detail, it is readily apparent that, although not articulated as such, his "Theory" contains primary and secondary effects of population size, density and heterogeneity. For example, one of the primary effects of size is the reduction of specified forms of social contact or interaction (Wirth,1938:11-13). This, in turn, results in the "superficiality, the anonymity, and the transitory character of urban-social relations . . . [which] constitutes essentially the state of anomie or the social void . . ." Thus, anomie is theorized as a secondary effect of population size: the reduction of meaningful social contact is the primary effect.

Two further steps are required to distill the theoretical "meat" and ascertain precisely what Wirth is postulating as cause and effect. Fischer (1972) re-organized Wirth's postulates in order to empirically test subjective dependent variables in Wirth's theory. Following Fischer's idea, it is first necessary to order them into behavioral, objective, and subjective measures. Then, when the results of that operation are clarified, to summarize the postulated effects by way of the mathematical operation of collecting like terms and simplifying. The initial postulates are depicted below. The subsequent steps are shown in Tables 2.1 and 2.2

A. Primary Effects of Size

> I The bonds of kinship, of neighborliness, and the sentiments arising out of living together under a common folk tradition are likely to be absent or, at best, relatively weak in an aggregate the members of which have such diverse origins and backgrounds. . . .This is not to say that the urban inhabitants have fewer acquaintances than rural inhabitants . . . they know a smaller proportion.(11,12)

B. Primary Effects of Density

II

Density . . . reinforces the effect of numbers . . . Typically, our physical contacts are close but our social contacts are distant.. . . Diverse population elements inhabiting a compact settlement thus tend to become segregated from one another in the degree in which their requirements and modes of life are incompatible with one another and in the measure in which they are antagonistic to one another. Similarly, persons of homogeneous status and needs unwittingly drift into, consciously select, or are forced by circumstances into, the same area. (14,15)

C. Primary Effects of Heterogeneity

III

The heightened mobility of the individual . . . subjects him to fluctuating status in the differentiated social groups that compose the social structure of the city . . . No single group has the undivided allegiance of the individual [who] acquires membership in widely divergent groups . . .(16)

IV

Overwhelmingly, the city-dweller is not a home-owner, and since a transitory habitat does not generate binding traditions and sentiments, only rarely is he truly a neighbor.(17)

D. Primary Effects of Urbanism

V . . . The larger, the more densely populated, and the more heterogeneous a community, the more accentuated the characteristics associated with urbanism will be.(9)

VI

. . . the substitution of secondary for primary contacts, the weakening bonds of kinship, and the declining social significance of the family, the disappearance of the neighborhood, and the undermining of the traditional basis of social solidarity. . . . In cities mothers are more likely to be employed, lodgers are more frequently part of the household, marriage tends to be postponed, and the proportion of single and unattached people is greater. Families are smaller and more frequently without children than in the country.(20-21)

> VII
> Being reduced to a stage of virtual impotence as an individual, the urbanite is bound to exert himself by joining with others of similar interest into organized groups to obtain his ends. This results in the enormous multiplication of voluntary organizations directed toward as great a variety of objectives as there are human needs and interests.(22)

> VIII
> It is largely through the activities of the voluntary groups, be their objectives economic, political, educational, religious, recreational, or cultural, that the urbanite expresses and develops his personality, acquires status, and is able to carry on the round of activities that constitute his life career.(23)

The first operation to be conducted in ordering the above postulates is to organize them into behavioral, objective, and subjective measures. The results of applying this technique are depicted in Table 2.1. It is clear from Table 2.1 that reduced neighboring (an effect of size) is also attributed to heterogeneity and that reduced kinship (an effect of size) is also an effect of urbanism. In fact, there are several effects listed which do not have a single cause but are attributed to several causes. In addition, Table 2.1 does not depict certain relationships of urbanism with size, density and heterogeneity which are quoted in the postulates preceding the Table.

For example, it will be noted in Postulate I that the effects of size are conditional on the presence of social heterogeneity; "an aggregate the members of which have such diverse origins and backgrounds." In Postulate II, "Density . . . reinforces the effects of numbers . . ." and in Postulate V, the presence of heterogeneity together with

Table 2.1 Postulated Direct Effects of Size, Density, and Heterogeneity.[1]

Behavioral Measures	Objective Measures	Subjective Measures	Postulate
	Increased Size		
Reduced kinship Reduced neighborliness	Smaller proportion of acquaintances than rural	Reduced rural values	I
	Increased Density		
	Increased distance of social contacts Decreased distance in face to face contacts Increased social heterogeneity Decreased social homogeneity	Increased differentiation of values Decreased similar values	II
	Increased Heterogeneity		
Increased mobility Increased membership in groups Increased range of groups	Increased mobility	Differentiated status Reduced binding traditions and values values	III
Decreased neighboring	Decreased home ownership		IV
	Increased Urbanism		
Replacement of primary by secondary contacts Weakening bonds of kinship	More mothers employed More lodgers in households Postponed age at marriage Increased proportion of single and unattached people Smaller families More families without children Disappearance of neighborhood	Declining social significance of family Disappearance of neighborhood Undermining of traditional basis of social solidarity	VI
Increased organizational membership Increase in number of voluntary organizations Wider variety of voluntary organizations			VII
		Voluntary group becomes source of expression Voluntary group becomes source of status	VIII

---

[1] Itemized from Wirth's (1938) postulates.

FINE PRINT

size and density, accentuates the characteristics of urbanism.

In order to simplify the relationships enumerated in the postulates, the effects of size, density, heterogeneity and urbanism depicted in Table 2.1 have been combined and sorted by type of behavior. This is shown in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2 presents a summary of the direct effects of increasing population size, density, and social heterogeneity which make up increasing urbanism as postulated by Wirth (1938). The effects were organized into behavioral, objective, and subjective components in order to clarify the relationships and levels of measurement or analysis. No linkages have been assumed between each set of effects although it may be argued, for example, that the result of "Replacement of primary by secondary contacts" will lead eventually to "Decreasing neighboring" and "Increasing organizational membership", Wirth (1938) does not specify in what order they will occur.

In Table 2.2, the behavioral measures of the effects of increasing urbanism are "Replacement of primary by secondary contacts" indicated by "Decreasing neighboring", "Decreasing kinship association," "Weakening bonds of kinship," "Increasing organizational membership," and "Increasing mobility." The objective measures of "Decreasing neighboring" which are also objective effects of increasing urbanism, are "Smaller proportions of acquaintances than rural" down to "Disappearance of the neighborhood" which is

Table 2.2 Postulated Direct Effects of Increasing Urbanism.[1]

Behavioral Measures	Objective Measures	Subjective Measures
Replacement of primary by secondary contacts (VI)[2]		Reduced rural values (I) Decreased similar values (II) Increased differentiation of values (II) Reduce binding and traditional values (III) Undermining of traditional basis of social solidarity (VI)
Decreasing neighboring (I,IV)	Smaller proportion of acquaintances than rural (I) Increased distance of social contacts (II) Decreasing distance in face to face contacts (II) Increasing social heterogeneity (II) Decreasing social homogeneity (II) Disappearance of neighborhood (VI)	Disappearance of neighborhood (VI)
Decreasing kinship association (I) Weakening bonds of kinship (VI)	More mothers employed (VI) More lodgers in households (VI) Postponed age at marriage (VI) Increasing proportion of single and unattached people (VI) Smaller families (VI) More families without children (VI)	Declining social significance of family (VI)
Increasing organizational membership (III,VII)	Increased number of voluntary organizations (VII) Wider variety of voluntary organizations (VII)	Voluntary group becomes source of expression (VIII) Voluntary group becomes source of social status (VIII)
Increasing mobility (III)	Increasing mobility (III) Decreased home ownership (IV)	Fluctuating social status (III)

[1] Condensed from Table 2.1 and Wirth's (1938) postulates.

[2] An additional relationship is postulated between increasing organizational membership, decreasing neighboring, and decreasing kinship association.

FINE PRINT

also assumed to be a subjective measure as well.

The subjective measures indicated opposite "Replacement of primary by secondary contacts" were placed in that location as they were not identified by Wirth (1938) with other behavioral or objective measures. The objective and subjective measures opposite the behavioral measures of kinship reflect Wirth's (1938) specification of the behavioral condition.

Focusing specifically on the measures of social contact in the behavioral column of Table 2.2, each of these, according to Wirth (1938), will be characterized by the respective objective and subjective measures across the Table. Thus, "Decreasing neighboring" will be characterized by "Smaller proportion of acquaintances than rural, Increased distance of social contacts, Decreasing distance in face to face contacts, Increasing social heterogeneity, Decreasing social homogeneity, and Disappearance of the neighborhood."

It may not be possible in a single study to measure many of Wirth's (1938) objective criteria, such as "Smaller proportion of acquaintances than rural" for example. Even more crucial is the lack of specification of the conditions under which criteria become relevant.

For example, all of the objective measures under kinship, except "More lodgers in household," are easily ascertained from the Census of Canada. With that one exception, all of the objective conditions have been met.

Does that mean that "Decreasing kinship association" or "Weakening bonds of kinship" are finally dependent on an increased number of lodgers or have the conditions for decreased kinship been met without it?

The links suggested by Wirth's postulates indicate more than simple linear causality but rather a dynamic model. In this case, it is the interaction of a number of factors over time which produce the postulated result. It is not the presence or absence of one particular variable. Furthermore, the apparent failure to achieve a specified behavioral condition in the light of achieved objective characteristics may be simply the result of not reaching a high enough level of population size, density, and heterogeneity.

From the Behavioral column of Table 2.2, it is clear that Wirth only identified neighboring and kinship association as primary types of social contact. He called organizational membership secondary contact. Cooley (1913:23-26), however, identified the family, the play group of children, the neighborhood group, and voluntary associations as primary types of social contact. To him, they constituted "the most important spheres of . . . intimate association and cooperation" which were "fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual" leading to what has since been identified as collective identity. Giddings (1897:4) also added friendship association as a fourth type of social contact which together with the other three constitute a large porportion of the social contact experienced by persons in society. Whether they are described as primary or secondary is not the central issue. Wirth's behavioral postulates may be tested without that distinction.

The last postulated effect in Table 2.2 may represent something of an anomaly. "Increasing mobility" is associated with "Fluctuating social status" in the subjective column. But the voluntary group (immediately above in the Table) "becomes the source of social status". The two relationships are not specified in more detail by Wirth (1938). It is possible that the effect of the voluntary group only operates with length of residence. Hence, if one is highly mobile, there is insufficient association within the group to attain social status.

Criteria for Testing Wirth

Before reviewing the empirical literature, the issue of bias should be considered. Guterman (1969:492-493) acknowledges that there are a number of critiques and empirical studies which fail to support Wirth (1938). But this failure, he suggests, is based on the fallacious assumption that *quantity* of social interaction is the same as *quality*. Researchers have measured the frequency of social contact more than the *meaning* of social contact. It is the latter which forms the basis of Wirth's (1938) postulates, Guterman contends. Wirth's (1938:12) use of descriptors, terms such as "impersonal, superficial, transitory, and segmental", and phrases such as, "the reserve, the indifference, and the blase outlook" underscore the qualitative rather than the quantitative dimension.

This would not have been an issue if researchers testing Wirth (1938) had identified this bias in forming conclusions about their results. For instead of finding a lack of empirical support for Wirth (1938), in some instances they would have found a lack of support for certain components of Wirth's (1938) postulates.

Guterman suggests (1969:493-494) that there are three conditions necessary for a complete test of Wirth's (1938) postulates:

1. Empirical measures should reflect the true dimensions implicit in Wirth's discussion.
2. Data should be derived from places with different population sizes and densities such as cities, small towns, and rural areas. Tests of Wirth based on residents in the same city are not a true comparative test.
3. Studies should include the total network of social relations including secondary relationships inferred from Wirth.

Given the evidence from Wirth (1938) reviewed earlier, there is no basic objection to conditions one and two above. Wirth (1938) does describe meaningful relationships which should be tested from both perspectives of quality and quantity. Moreover, as Wirth (1938:2,3) introduces his postulates with statements referring to differences between the city and rural society, any test of his subsequent postulates which uses a smaller range of data should acknowledge that limitation. But there is a problem with Guterman's third condition.

It was earlier demonstrated (Tables 2.1 and 2.2) that Wirth only referred directly to three forms of social contact: neighboring, kinship association, and organizational membership. It was also clear from the presentation that Wirth regarded the first two, neighboring and kinship association, as primary forms of social contact. The third, organizational membership, he regarded as secondary. The postulates which contain these forms of social contact are relational and as such form a holistic model of urban society. That is, if one or other form of social contact increases, another decreases, and secondary effects are anticipated. Hence, all that is absolutely necessary in terms of testing Wirth is to demonstrate in accordance with conditions one and two that one of these forms of social contact does not behave in the manner predicted. What, in fact, is prescribed in condition three, is a test of social contact that exceeds the requirements for an adequate test of Wirth.

Summary

This chapter focused on the behavioral postulates of Wirth's (1938) "Theory of Urbanism" and the criteria under which they may be properly tested. It was concluded that Wirth (1938) can only be properly tested if two conditions are observed, namely:

1. Empirical measures should reflect the true dimensions implicit in Wirth's discussion.
2. Data should be derived from places with different population sizes and densities such as cities, small towns, and rural areas.

In the next chapter we turn to an examination and discussion of empirical tests of the behavioral measures of Wirth's (1938) postulates.

III. EMPIRICAL TESTS OF WIRTH

Introduction

It was shown earlier (Chapter II) that the behavioral postulates of Wirth (1938) could only be adequately tested under certain conditions. That is, the empirical measures should accurately represent the meaningful dimensions of Wirth's concepts. Data should be derived from the entire range of population sizes and densities including cities and rural areas.

The aim of the present chapter is to review selected empirical tests of Wirth (1938) and demonstrate the limitations of that procedure for testing the determinants of social contact. The related theoretical issues of population turnover and occupational mobility will also be reviewed.

Empirical Tests of Wirth

The review of empirical tests of the behavioral measures of Wirth's (1938) postulates will be confined to those authors who specifically cited Wirth (1938) and were not simply conducting a review of the literature. Only three studies were found which met this constraint and which also met Guterman's (1969) first two conditions; Key (1961), Key (1965), and Guterman (1969).

Testing "the hypothesized disintegration of the family in urban areas," a proposition advanced by Wirth (1938), Key (1961:53) surveyed a large sample of residents in the mid-Western United States. The sample was stratified by location of residence (rural, village, small town, city, metropolitan area) and sex. A scale which measured the extent and quality of kinship participation in the sample was used as the dependent variable. His findings (1961:54-55) did not support the hypothesized relation between family disintegration and increasing urbanism. In support of his findings Key (1961) tabulated the scores but did not report if the rural-urban differences between scores were significant.

Using the same data as his 1961 study, Key (1965) tested the "neighboring decreasing with urbanism" postulate using a neighboring scale to measure the extent and quality of neighboring in the sample. His data support the above postulate (1965:384) with significant differences (Chi Square < .001) between places even when age and sex are controlled. But he noted a non-significant interaction between socio-economic status and sex; rural males and urban females show higher levels of neighboring.

Guterman (1969:496) surveyed a stratified random sample of white collar hotel employees in 26 hotels operated by two chains between Washington, D.C., and Bangor, Maine, using an index of friendship ties. He (1969:497) found that intimacy of friendship ties varies inversely with population size. But he warns that the finding is not generalizable due to the sampling procedure; white collar hotel employees in large cities and suburbs are less likely to have close friendships than white collar hotel employees in small towns.

If Guterman's (1969) third condition, that studies should include the total network of social relations including secondary relationships, were to be accepted, then none of these three studies (including Guterman's) can be considered an adequate test of Wirth (1938). As Guterman's (1969) third condition is rejected, however, Key's (1965) conclusion on neighboring supports Wirth (1938) but his study (1961) of kin relations does not. Moreover, Guterman's (1969) study of friendship may be discounted as evidence in support of Wirth strictly on the basis that Wirth (1938) did not directly mention friendship. Hence, a conclusion regarding these tests of Wirth (1938) becomes one of semantics.

Other Empirical Tests of Wirth

A further thirteen studies were identified which specifically cited Wirth (1938) but did not fulfill Guterman's (1969) first two conditions. These studies will be reviewed in detail later. The point at issue here is the merit of testing Wirth's (1938) behavioral postulates exclusively while excluding an examination of other possible relationships. When the results of these thirteen studies are tabulated together with the three studies reviewed above and summarized according to dependent variables and identified independent variables, certain conclusions are evident. In Table 3.1, the three studies which fulfilled

Table 3.1 Variables correlated with Social Contact when Testing Wirth

Variables	Neighboring	Friends	Kin	Organizational
Sex	g,k,n[1]	k	k,l,n	a,n
Marital Status	g,k,p	k	k	a
Length of Residence	b,c,g,k,o,p	c,k,o	k,o	o
Children (Life Cycle)	b,f,k,p	f,k	f,k	f
Proximity	b			
Relatives	b			
No Car	b			
Social Class	c,f	f	f	f
Income	d,k,p	d,k	d,k	d
Education	d,g,k,p	d,k	d,k	d
Occupation	d,k	d,k	d,k,l	d
Ethnicity	d,g,k	d,k	d,k	
Urbanism	h	h	e,h	h
Location	f,n	f	f,l,n	b,f,n
Age	g,k,o,p	k,o	k,o	
Owned Home	g			
Population Size	g,j,o	m,o	i,o	
Religion	k	k	k	
Population Density	p			
Open Space	p			

[1] a = Dotson (1951)
b = Foley (1952)
c = Smith et al(1954)
d = Axelrod (1956)
e = Garigue (1956)
f = Bell & Boat(1957)
g = Fava (1958)
h = Greer and Kube (1959)
i = Key (1961)
j = Key (1965)
k = Tomeh (1967)
l = Adams (1968)
m = Guterman (1969)
n = Tallman et al (1970)
o = Kasarda et al (1974)
p = Fox et al (1980)

Guterman's (1969) first two conditions are identified as i, j, and m on the variable population size. The other thirteen studies, which focused on forms of social contact in more restricted ranges of rural-urban settings, identified a further nineteen variables crucial to explaining and/or associated with one or other social contact. Moreover, the relationships documented do not vary by location of study or by methodology. Apart from i, j and m, o and p sampled rural to urban populations; a, b, c, and l sampled middle-sized cities, and the balance (d,e,f,g,h, k,n,o,p) sampled large-sized cities. Only a, e, and o drew non-random samples.

Given no systematic variation by location or method with these results, it may be argued that only focusing on testing Wirth is less productive than focusing on testing the correlates of social contact. Wirth's postulates present a narrower range of alternate variables and thereby reduce the number of potential alternate explanations.

In other words, testing a theory which posits negative effects on specific types of social contact does not provide a theoretical basis for searching for effects that do occur under certain conditions on other types of social contact. This should not be construed, however, as a general criticism of Wirth's (1938) postulates. It is solely concerned with the behavioral aspects of his postulates. As is evident above, the behavioral aspects of Wirth's (1938) postulates have not been adequately tested. If Guterman's

(1969) third condition is accepted as well, even the studies which correctly identified the proper data base have only tested part of his model and hence, have not adequately tested Wirth (1938) either.

Other Theoretical Problems

Lack of definitive conclusions regarding the effects of location on socializing, however, led to a discussion of methodological problems regarding certain aspects of Wirth's (1938) theory. Wirth had postulated (1938) that increasing population size, density, and heterogeneity would reduce levels of social contact between two ideal types of community, urban-industrial and folk-rural. Population migration, rural to urban and urban to rural, however, served to confound the distance/location effect. This migration was identified with two separate but connected issues; population turnaround and occupational mobility.

A number of researchers (e.g. Greer,1956;Key,1965; Tallman and Morgner,1970) had documented that social interaction increased with distance from the Central Business District (CBD). They found high levels of social contact and mutual support in the suburbs compared to inner city neighborhoods. Pryor argued (1968:208), however, that the rural-urban fringe was characterized by low levels of social contact. The rural-urban fringe was characteristically populated by recent movers, of whom over 50 percent were resident less than 5 years. They demonstrated low levels of social interaction, community participation, and organizational membership. Pryor's argument was inconsistent with the expected high levels of social contact but it was partially supported by empirical evidence from Zuiches (1970) and McVey (1978). From a study of national migration in the United States, Zuiches (1970:418) found that small towns were growing at a faster rate than larger places in non-metropolitan counties. McVey (1978:15) in a study of migration and smaller communities in Alberta, Canada, noted the movement of people from metropolitan areas to smaller communities in non-metropolitan areas.

Evidence from other sources (Gale,1979;Long,1980) suggests that the association of location with levels of social contact is even more complex. As part of the population turnaround, people are resettling in some inner city areas. From an analysis of data on several large cities in the United States, Gale (1979:295-296) found these resettlers to be predominantly younger, well educated, white, and higher earning professionals or technocrats living in one- or two-person households. Most come from other areas of the same city, not the suburbs. The second highest proportion come from outside the metropolitan area. Gale (1979:295-296) insists that the 'back to the city movement' is a misnomer. It infers that most resettlers are dissatisfied former suburbanites. These data show conclusively that the majority of the resettlers rejected suburbia both in their original settlement and in resettlement. Moreover, a majority of resettlers are moving from renting to owning. The major reasons for their move are positively focused on the city and its amenities; the architectural/historical character of house/neighborhood, accessibility to place of employment, acceptable housing price and investment potential, and the cultural, social, and/or shopping opportunities of the city.

From a review of migration studies and United States Census data, Long (1980:62-66) concluded that there are two migration streams currently operating in and around many large cities. The first in time, the back to the city movement, began during the 1960-1970 decade and was documented through age-specific net migration rates of whites, aged 20 to 24 into Washington, D.C., Boston, and Manhatten. But Long concludes (1980:66) that, given the social characteristics of the migrants, the back to the city movement more likely originated in the city than in the suburbs. The back to the city movers are mostly younger, career-minded, ambitious, two-earner couples owning renovated town houses. Long also noted (1980:90) that back to the city movers are seldom credited with positive motivations toward the city but are often described as dissatisfied suburbanites.

The second movement, the back to the countryside movement (Long,1980:62-66), began in the early 1970's with persons moving from metropolitan counties to non-metropolitan counties which, for the most part, were not adjacent to metropolitan counties and therefore could not be interpreted as an extension of urban sprawl.

The motivation for the back to the country movement, Long (1980:68-71) suggests, is based on four factors:

1. Decentralization of employment opportunities.
2. A renewed search for energy (re-opening coal mines).
3. Increase in retirement and recreational pursuits.
4. A preference for living in small towns and rural areas.

These factors suggest (Long, 1980:70) that back to the country movers are a heterogeneous group of older retirees, young wage earners, and middle aged persons sacrificing income for preferential life style.

The foregoing accounts tend to confound attempts at predicting levels of social interaction in the city and suburb. Before cities changed their pattern of outward growth, social interaction increased with distance from the CBD. The presumed effect of the population movement from the city to the rural-urban fringe was expected to lower the levels of social interaction beyond the suburbs. But the other population movement, as it appears to be a movement within the city proper, may have no effect at all.

A further assumption about levels of social contact is prompted by the observation of Logan and Semyonov (1980:96) that suburbs have aged and restrictions have been placed on their growth. As higher levels of social interaction were associated with growing suburbs, growth restrictions may foster lower levels of social interaction.

The solution to this dilemma, according to Gans (1968:152) and Marshall (1973:143), is to change the specifications of the inquiry. Location is not the key explanatory variable in social interaction. Researchers should ascertain and evaluate the types of variables that determine social contact (Marshall,1973:143) and compare them across locations.

This is not to argue that locational aspects are unimportant. In a study of rural-urban differences in levels of satisfaction, Miller and Crader (1979:502) found that rural-urban differences are real. Caplow and Forman (1950:366) found that social homogeneity was crucial to group formation, which depends on the locational visibility of neighbors. Wilson (1968:28-29) further argued that small towns and suburbs, because of their visible social homogeneity, foster the creation of a sense of community. This emphasis on the determinants of social contact, however, raised the older methodological issue of the negative effects of occupational mobility on socializing.

Occupational mobility was considered to have a negative effect on stable social relationships. For this reason, it was included by Freeman et al (1957) in a multivariate analysis of the determinants of organizational membership. Job mobility was found (Freeman et al,1957:531-532) to be positively and significantly related to the number of memberships.

In examining the effects of occupational mobility on socializing with friends and on socializing with neighbors, Curtis (1959a:297) found no significant differences between mobile and non-mobile family heads, even after controlling for age and type of work. Curtis' results did show small differences which were not significant. The upwardly mobile, non-manual worker, under 40 years of age socialized slightly less than the non-mobile.

In another example, Curtis (1959b:847) examined the relationship between occupational mobility and organizational membership controlling for sex, occupation, type of organization, and status composition. His data failed to support the hypothesis that mobile persons are more isolated, in terms of non-membership, than their stable peers. The only significant difference in the data occurred between stable and mobile white collar workers belonging to sporting and hobby clubs.

In a study of the effects of occupational mobility on socializing with relatives, Litwak (1960a:10,15-20) observed that occupational mobility is assumed to have a negative effect on extended family contact due to the high status motivation of the upwardly mobile. No significant differences were found between mobile and stable socializing patterns even after controls were introduced for high mobility, geographic location, age, extended family identification, and status concern. Litwak demonstrated that those least likely to socialize with relatives have lower occupational resources (stationary manual workers) and are non-status and non-family oriented. Although this empirical evidence fails to support the hypothesis, occupational mobility is still held to be a factor influencing social relationships.

Summary

In this chapter a number of issues were reviewed which result from a discussion of testing Wirth (1938). All of them were found to be problematic and restricted in scope. Empirical tests of the behavioral postulates of Wirth (1938) which fulfilled the test conditions produced equivocal results based on population size.

Other empirical studies which specifically tested Wirth (1938) but failed to meet the test conditions laid down in Chapter II, demonstrated a much wider range of independent variables as determinants of social contact. But these results were inconclusive due to problems associated with the variables selected and comparability of the data. Thus it may be concluded that, for the purpose of testing for the determinants of social contact, Wirth's (1938) focus is too narrow. The wider focused empirical research which tested Wirth (1938), however, is not comparable and is inconclusive. Other empirical research addressed related issues such as population turnaround and occupational mobility but it, too, was found to be lacking in conclusive evidence.

The narrow focus of this type of enquiry ultimately led to the delineation of broader-based models to account for forms of social contact in urban settings. These are reviewed in the next chapter.

IV. THE THEORETICAL FOCUS OF SUBURBAN RESEARCH

Introduction

In previous chapters, it was demonstrated that the behavioral postulates presented by Wirth (1938) have not been conclusively tested. Wirth's focus on three independent variables, size, density, and heterogeneity, however, presents too narrow a focus for empirical research to ascertain the determinants of social contact in urban-suburban locations. Some empirical tests of Wirth revealed a wider range of determinants but the results were non-comparable or inconclusive. Several theoretical models which attempt to provide a wider focus to empirically establish determinants of social contact are discussed in the present chapter.

The Theoretical Models

It was quite evident to some researchers (Gans,1968; Michelson,1970;Marshall,1973;Fischer,1975;Fischer and Jackson,1976) that social contact has many more dimensions than those postulated by Wirth (1938). His theory was not sufficiently comprehensive to explain the empirical complexities of urban living. This conclusion led to the emergence of theoretical frameworks which attempt to account for the determinants of social contact socially and spatially. Six uniquely specified models have been identified through a comprehensive search of the literature. These unique specifications have been referred to by some of the authors (e.g. Fischer and Jackson, 1975) as models. However, the term is not defined. For the purposes of this study, a model is a unique specification of independent variables in relation to a form of social contact to account for an observed social reality. The model is thus placed above the level of a hypothesis. It imparts a theoretical imperative to subsequent empirical analysis. The six models were placed in order according to the number of independent variables identified beginning with the smallest number and proceeding to the largest. The first three models were identified by Kennedy (1982:130). The other three are obtained by combining models proposed by Marshall (1973) and Fischer and Jackson (1976). As each set of three models has a unique focus, they are presented separately below.

Models 1 - 3. The three models identified by Kennedy (1982:130) emphasize how freedom of choice helps individuals adapt to life in the cities. Gans' (1968) model is based on Social Homogeneity; Michelson's (1970) on Environmental Choice; and Fischer's (1975) on Urbanism based on population size and density. These are discussed below.

1. Social Homogeneity. In an essay entitled "Urbanism and Suburbanism as Ways of Life: A Re-evaluation of Definitions" which first appeared in 1962, Gans (1968:34-35) reviewed Wirth's (1938) article and argued that Wirth's theory needs to be revised for two reasons:

1. A number of changes have taken place in and around cities since the time of Wirth's article and these,

understandably, are not included in Wirth's theory. The changes refer to phenomenon such as the movement to the suburbs and the decentralization of industry.

2. The contrast inherent in Wirth's theory between the city and _folk_ society is less valid than the more comtemporary comparison between the city and _rural_ society. Gans argues (1968:35) that comparing pre-industrial to industrial society fosters the identification of groups such as voluntary associations with cities whereas, in fact, voluntary associations do exist in rural society.

According to Gans (1968:35), Wirth's (1938) theory attributes many characteristics of modern society, even some found in rural places, to the city. What is required, he continues, is an analysis of the differences between types of settlement. Accordingly, Gans recommends limiting the discussion to a comparison of urban and suburban ways of life. At the same time, Gans (1968:35) questions whether life style differences between settlements constitute a relevant distinction.

Gans (1968:36) criticizes Wirth's (1938) "diagnosis of the city" for three reasons:

1. Wirth's (1938) conclusions are based on inner city (Chicago) data.
2. There is insufficient evidence (from Gans' analysis) to support Wirth's (1938) postulates.
3. Even if Wirth's (1938) postulates are verifiable, a

large proportion of city residents are isolated from Wirth's postulated consequences. Cultural patterns are brought to the city by migrants and social structures are developed in the newly settled areas.

Gans (1968:36-39) pointed out that the evidence from different life style groups he found in the inner city does not support the demise of primary social relationships which are postulated by Wirth (1938). Gans argued (1968:44-45) that ecological limitiations on social life in the city only pertain if people lack the ability to make choices. If people are free to choose to participate in socializing, Gans concluded they would do so on the basis of social class and stage in the family life cycle. Socializing will increase with social class and with the transition from single to married to family-rearing. Gans added that these "two characteristics will go far in explaining the kinds of housing and neighborhoods they will occupy." Marshall (1973:126) also delineated this model as one of three ways to differentiate life style between city and suburb.

2. Environmental Choice. Michelson (1970), unlike Gans (1968), did not cite Wirth (1938) as a focus for his discussion of Man in His Urban Environment. He was interested in the larger problem of how urban residents use their social and physical surroundings. Michelson reviewed (1970:3-17) the contribution of human ecology to understanding urban life. He (1970:19) concluded that it is not possible to document individual responses to city life

from an aggregate perspective. The number of variables that have been overlooked in this way are crucial to understanding individual choice. Individual responses (such as types of physical space or building types) have to be measured in terms of the balance or congruence (Michelson,1970:24) between individual characteristics, values, and the social and physical environment. He maintained (Michelson,1970:47) that as "people are separated in space from other people and from nonresidential activities", the individual level of analysis has to take into account all the possible choices people make in that environment. To do less would be to lose meaning. But this framework is not without some order. The choices that individuals make, according to Michelson (1970:62-63), are governed by their life style based on their economic, ethnic, and life cycle stage. In essence, this model builds on Model 1, Social Homogeneity, by adding variables associated with the physical environment, values, and perceptions. No direction is hypothesized for this relationship, however.

3. Urbanism. Addressing the question, "what are the social effects of urbanism," (Fischer:1975:1319) argues that the evidence used by Gans (1968) among others to present an alternative to Wirth's (1938) postulates, may also be used to present a third position. Gans' (1968) "non-ecological" position which ignores the independent effects of population size and density (Fischer,1975:1321-1322) fails to account

for rural-urban differences in belief and behavior such as deviance and innovation. Population concentration has an effect on behavior beyond that accounted for by personal characteristics.

By refuting Gans (1968) for ignoring population concentration in accounting for urban behavior and by re-affirming ecological or aggregate variables of population size and density criticized by Michelson (1970), Fischer (1975) provides an alternative model which encompasses parts of Models 1, Social Homogeneity, and 2, Environmental Choice. Fischer (1975:1323) argues that urbanism based on population size affects social life in the city by creating and strengthening subcultures. For Fischer, a subculture (1975:1323):

> "is a set of modal beliefs, values, norms, and customs associated with . . . relatively distinct . . . social . . . networks and institutions . . . existing within a larger social system and culture."

Subcultures consist (Fischer,1975:1324-1325) of people with identifiable like characteristics such as ethnicity, religion, or occupation. Increasing concentrations of people, far from destroying meaningful social contact, create more opportunities for subcultures to develop and proliferate. This happens in two ways. First, large cities attract more migrants from greater varieties of cultural backgrounds than smaller centres. Second, large size fosters structural differentiation and each of the resulting specialized institutions has the capacity for subcultural development.

Population concentration, particularly population size (Fischer,1975:1323-1324), further intensifies subcultures by affording expanded opportunities for institutional support. The same mechanism promotes a greater variety of subcultural groups and hence, promotes intensity through intergroup conflict. So, for Fischer (1975), Model 3, controlling for personal characteristics, posits that social contact and interaction will increase with population concentration and the presence of subcultures based on ethnicity, religion, or occupation.

Models 4 -6. Three additional models were identified by Marshall (1973) and Fischer and Jackson (1976) in comprehensive reviews of the suburban literature. All three models attempt to account for differences in social contact between the city and the suburb and thus, expand on Wirth's (1938) behavioral and objective effects discussed earlier in Table 2.2.

Marshall (1973:124) addressed two questions: "To what extent do suburbanites differ from urbanites in their life style? What are the causes of these differences, if they exist at all?" According to Marshall (1973:125-126), life style differences between city and suburb may be differentiated in three ways. Two of these are presented below, the other was included in Model 1, Social Homogeneity, (Gans,1968) earlier.

Structural and Demographic Characteristics. "Structural and demographic characteristics of the suburb may produce a distinct style of life." For example, commuting restricts the amount of activity time a breadwinner has available to participate in the local community. Similarly, the suburban community has only a narrow range of institutional activities in which suburbanites may participate.

Selective Migration. "Suburban life styles become differentiated through selective migration." That is, families with certain attitudes and values choose the suburbs while other families with different attitudes and values stay in the city. Marshall (1973:126) notes the possibility of interaction between structural and selective migration variables causing effects which could not be accounted for by individual variables.

In addition, Marshall (1968:126-127) points out that the key distinction between selective migration and class and life cycle (Model 1, Social Homogeneity) positions is that selective migration is not solely based on class and life cycle. Some middle class families with children will choose the suburbs while some will remain in the city.

Focusing on the social psychological aspects of suburban life, Fischer and Jackson (1976:279) present several theoretical models. Three of their models are pertinent to the consideration of the behavioral aspects of Wirth's (1938) postulates. They are Individual Traits, Distance Effects, and Contextual Effects. Fischer and

Jackson (1976:280) did not discuss the relative theoretical merits of their models. They chose to operationalize and empirically test them. This was accomplished through a secondary analyses of two comprehensive data sets where operationalization of variables crucial to the respective theoretical models is possible.

The operationalization of Fischer and Jackson's (1976) three models was combined with two of Marshall's (1976) models with some modifications (noted below) to produce Models 4, 5, and 6. Fischer and Jackson's (1976:279,291,299) Individual Traits model was combined with all but two variables from Marshall's (1973:125-126) Structural and Demographic Characteristics to produce Model 4, Personal Characteristics. Fischer and Jackson's (1976:279-280) Distance Effects was combined with Marshall's (1973:133-134) Selective Migration to produce Model 5, Distance Effects. The two variables, social homogeneity and population density, from Marshall's (1973:128-129) first model were combined with Fischer and Jackson's (1976:279) Contextual Effects model to produce Model 6, Contextual Variables. These models are described as follows:

4. Personal Characteristics. This model posits that differences in levels of social contact between urban or suburban residents vary by personal characteristics which affect individual life styles in a given location. For example, commuting time restricts the amount of discretionary time a working spouse has available to

participate in the social life of a suburb. The direction of these relationships indicated by Marshall is given in parentheses after the following specification of variables. In his model, Marshall (1973:127-133) included commuting (negative), social homogeneity (varies), density (varies), patterns of leisure (unspecified), sex (unspecified), social class (positive), religious participation (varies), and home ownership (positive).

Fischer and Jackson (1976:279) operationalized their "Individual Traits Model" using (291,299) age, sex, education, occupation, occupational status of head, family income, ethnicity, religion, number of children, length of residence, house type, number of cars, and wife works. Direction of the various relationships was not given.

5. Distance Effects. Marshall argued (1973:133-137) that social contact such as neighboring increased with distance from the CBD due to selective migration. That is, people who are oriented towards increased social contact move to the suburbs. In order to demonstrate the distance effect, Marshall warned (1973:137) that Model 1, Social Homogeneity, and Model 4, Personal Characteristics, variables have to be controlled.

Fischer and Jackson maintain (1976:282) that suburbanites "personal networks" of social contact will tend to be more localized due to the increased time-cost of maintaining contact across the greater metropolitan area. They further argue (Fischer and Jackson, 1976:283) that there is insufficient evidence to draw conclusions about social contact reasons for selective migration because they feel that the migrant's concern for more space, housing, and neighborhood quality is more important. Hence, they conclude (Fischer and Jackson,1976:285) that "the peripheral physical location of suburbanites encourages a social and psychological focus on the local area."

The Distance Effects model, that informal social contact increases with distance from the CBD, differs slightly in its specifications. For Marshall (1973:133-134) the model works after controlling Model 1, Social Homogeneity, and Model 4, Personal Characteristics, variables. For Fischer and Jackson (1976:279-280), it works irrespective of personal and structural variables. The model is physically deterministic in that space/location has an independent effect after controlling for other variables.

6. Contextual Variables. In the "Contextual Effects Model" outlined by Fischer and Jackson (1976:279), they argue that differences in the behavior of individuals are attributable to the composition of the population in a certain locale "above and beyond those created by personal traits." Their specification of the model is significant in that it reflects an earlier finding that has not been subsequently tested. Neighboring was found (Bernard,1937) to be partly a function of the social characteristics of the surrounding population, in particular, the proportion of the population over 65 years of age.

This model may be referred to as a socially deterministic model. It argues that social behavior is caused by the social character of a place, or, in other words, the social characteristics perceived by newcomers cause them to socialize in certain ways. The significant variable in that case would be length of residence and the equivalence of a respondent's personal characteristics with those of the area. Fischer and Jackson (1976) use two contextual measures--proportion of youth and average income in the census tract--for which a positive relationship is inferred. To this is added social homogeneity (Wirth,1938: 14-15;Marshall,1973:128-129) and population density (Wirth,1938:9;Marshall,1973:129-130).

These six models represent concepts developed to expand on Wirth's (1938) focus to account for the determinants of social contact in urban and suburban areas. All six models taken together have not been tested at one time, in a single context of enquiry.

Summary

Six models which attempt to account for the determinants of various forms of social contact were presented in order of increasing complexity in terms of the numbers of variables included. The models propose that social contact increase according to the presence of certain variables, as follows:

Model 1, Social Homogeneity, based on social class and stage in the family life cycle.

Model 2, Environmental Choice, based on the physical environment, values, and perceptions.
Model 3, Urbanism, derived from population size and ethnic, religious, or occupational subcultures.
Model 4, Personal Characteristics, includes variables such as sex, house type, and wife working.
Model 5, Distance Effects, based on distance from the CBD.
Model 6, Contextual Effects, the social character of a place such as the proportion of youth in an area.

As noted above, the models have not been tested at one time. To do so, is the task of this project. In order to operationalize the concepts in the models, in the next chapter, the six models are applied to past empirical research on social contact as an organizing device. Through this procedure, it is hoped to ascertain which models are most helpful as predictors and which variables have been found to be important.

V. REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON SOCIAL CONTACT

Introduction

The six theoretical models discussed in the last chapter account for determinants of various types of social contact. These models will be applied to empirical research which specifically tested four types of social contact; organizational membership, neighboring, socializing with kin, and socializing with friends.

The empirical research was discovered by identifying several more recent studies which tested social contact and by following up references, bibliographies, and literature reviews until all sources were checked. This process resulted in the discovery of some eighty studies covering nearly fifty years of social research to the present time.

The present chapter begins with some qualifying statements about the scope of the review. Then, the empirical studies are reviewed by type of social contact and, within each social contact, by model as well. The results of the review of each type of social contact are summarized at the end of each type. At the end of the chapter, a final summary of models by type of social contact will be followed by a summary of models across types of social contact.

The Review

Some indication of the theoretical focus of the studies reviewed below may be gained by tabulating the references cited. Of those who referenced major sociological theorists, 48 percent referenced Wirth (1938). Less than 25 percent referenced the next most frequently cited theorists, Toennies and Parsons. Hence, this empirical research, which has been actively pursuing the determinants of social contact, may have actually restricted its theoretical base through this concentration on Wirth (1938). As was stated earlier, Wirth's (1938) postulated negative effects of urbanism on social contact is a much narrower research focus than searching for the determinants of social contact. At the same time, it must be noted that Wirth's (1938) theory constitutes a more solid scientific basis for research than the wider based alternative.

Three conditions have been applied to make the review more manageable:

1. Discussion of the studies reviewed is confined to results in terms of relationships between specific variables and measures of social contact. Generally, individual studies which, for varying reasons, introduce controls of specified variables will not be reported in detail as no systematic differences were detected which would enhance the purpose of this review. Where such differences are crucial to this examination, detailed reporting follows.
2. All things being equal, a study which uses multivariate analysis to analyze data may be superior in terms of the completeness of the analysis to one using simpler

methods and fewer variables. This conclusion would be more positive if the more complex analysis included the entire range of possible variables in its analysis. Unfortunately, this has not been the case with the studies reviewed below. In most instances the multivariate analyses were secondary analyses of existing data and were therefore limited by the original purpose of those data. In other instances, the breadth of the data was limited by the theoretical perspective of the author(s) who restricted the range of variables collected.

3. As the models set out earlier are roughly cumulative starting with the smallest number of variables and ending with the largest, studies are normally included under the highest model number. Where only a few studies exist to support a particular model, results from higher models will be used.

In reviewing these studies, it should be noted that apparent discrepancies (e.g. negative and positive correlations from different studies of one independent variable with one dependent variable) may be the result of differences in measurement of either variable. The studies reviewed were limited to those which directly or indirectly examined social contact. Sometimes, for example, the social contact was measured as frequency of contact, at others, as numbers of friends. In order to simplify this review, this distinction was set aside.

Turning now to the application of the six models discussed above to empirical research on social contact, we will focus first on organizational membership or participation in formal organizations.

A major reason to keep relationships with the four types of social contact distinct is the unique finding (Rosow,1967:219) that one type of social contact cannot compensate for another, although there may be some overlap. This finding is supported by Mogey's observation (1977:421) that kinship, friendship, and neighboring are independent systems. Other findings (Shulman,1967b:158; Wellman,1979: 1214) indicate that the type of help and the type of socializing actually vary by type of social contact. Until this connection is documented further, it will be necessary to keep the four types of social contact separate.

The review of empirical research on organizational membership will be followed successively by reviews of neighboring, socializing with kin, and socializing with friends. This chapter concludes with a summary statement of the implications for further testing.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP

Thirty-seven studies were reviewed. Each of the studies reported original analysis or research focusing on the correlates or determinants of organizational membership. These studies support Models 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6. Not one study supports Model 3.

Overall, no bias was detected between the results and the type of sampling. With certain exceptions, all studies focused on the number and type of organizational membership. Larson (1938) and Bell and Boat (1957) addressed frequency of organizational attendance. Gans (1968) described organizational and formal associational relations in qualitative terms. Any differences in results between locations of studies will be discussed as the review proceeds. Each respective model will now be applied to the empirical research on organizational membership.

Model 1, Social Homogeneity.

No studies which directly tested Wirth (1938) support Model 1 exclusively. Two studies in mid-sized cities which support Model 4 (Dotson,1951; Foley,1952), however, found family life cycle to be an important variable associated with organizational membership. Eight other studies (Lazarsfeld et al,1948[1944]:173;Bushee,1945;223-224; Komarovsky,1946:688-690;Knupfer,1947:105;Litwak,1960a:19; 1961:268;Cohen and Hodges,1963:315;Gans,1968:134) which support Model 1 found social class positively related to organizational membership irrespective of methodology or place of study. Places studied included large cities (Komarovsky,1946; Litwak,1960a;1961;Cohen and Hodges,1963), suburbs and small towns (Knupfer,1947; Gans,1968), and counties (Lazarsfeld et al,1948[1944]). Additionally, Komarovsky (1946:688-690) found from her study of New York City employees that membership in certain types of organization was a function of the respondent's sex. Similar results were obtained by Bushee (1945:218) in a study of organization membership in Boulder County, Colorado. Both findings are considered consistent with the specifications of Model 1 and do not represent a bias on the basis of location. No exclusive evidence in support of family life cycle for Model 1 was found but this variable is supported in higher models.

Model 2, Environmental Choice.

The only study that presents evidence in partial support of Model 2 is Freeman, Novak and Reeder (1957). This study is also noteworthy in that it is one of the few studies to use multivariate analysis and it is the earliest to do so. Freeman et al (1957:529) attempted to ascertain the correlates of membership in voluntary associations from a multi-stage area sample of Spokane, Washington. The types of independent variables used included various measures of social class, family life cycle, residential and job mobility, shelter costs, attitudes towards the community, and personal values. The dependent variable was dichotomized into joiners and non-joiners. Variables which correlated (tetrachoric) higher than .10 with organizational membership were used in a multiple regression analysis. It demonstrated (Freeman et al,1957:511-512) that membership was positively associated with income, residential mobility, job mobility, and positive attitudes towards the community and its leaders. It was negatively associated with the large size of the community. Freeman et al (1957:532) noted that income received the highest beta weight when a measure of social class lost significance.

Freeman et al (1957:532-533) re-analyzed these variables using factor analysis and confirmed high factor loadings on four factors which they labelled social class, satisfaction with the community, pessimism-optimism, and mobility. The pessimism part of the third factor contains attitudes towards physical aspects of the community while the optimism variable concerns attitudes towards the future of the community. Both residential and job mobility are identified in the fourth factor. Freeman et al (1957:533) concluded that future research should examine more rigorously the measurement of variables associated with attitudes and values.

As reported, the evidence from Freeman et al (1957) does not provide strong support of Model 2. But their findings may have been biased by their exclusion of independent variables from the multiple regression analysis which correlated at less than .10 with organizational membership.

Model 4. Personal Characteristics.

Twenty-three studies were found which support Model 4. No systematic variation between the findings and methodology or place of study could be discerned. Studies which directly tested Wirth (1938) under Model 4 included Dotson (1951), Foley (1952), Axelrod (1956) and Kasarda and Janowitz

(1974).

Dotson (1951:687-688) noted that Wirth's (1938) postulated effects of increasing urbanism needed to be modified. Increased organizational membership was found to be a function of higher income and social class (e.g. Mather, 1941; Bushee, 1945; Komarovsky, 1946) rather than increasing urbanism. But the forms of social organization pursued by lower income persons (Dotson, 1951:688) were not identified. Dotson's (1951:689-691) case study of fifty selected urban families with skilled and semi-skilled fathers confirmed the earlier findings. The majority of his sample participated extensively in informal social relations with kin rather than in organizations. For lower income persons, organizational membership varied by sex and by marital status. Dotson (1951:693) acknowledged that the theoretical significance of his findings needed further exploration and empirical testing but his findings do not support the relevant behavioral postulates (VII, Table 2.2) of Wirth (1938).

In his study of neighboring in Rochester, N.Y., Foley (1952) indirectly tested Wirth (1938). He noted (1952:8-9) that Wirth (1938) was one of a number of scholars who posited that urbanization would eventually eliminate the neighborhood "as a vital functioning unit in the large city." Foley (1952:11) developed three hypotheses to test in a middle class area of a middle-sized city:

1. "City residents typically fall considerably short of

being thoroughgoing 'urbanites' . . ."

2. "City residents . . . show marked variability in their positions along a local to metropolitan dimension . . ."
3. "This local-nonlocal axis represents basically a single main dimension."

From a systematic random sample, Foley (1952:59-60) found support for hypotheses 1 and 2. Residents showed extreme ranges of variability in neighboring patterns, in use of local facilities, and in participation in voluntary organizations. Local participation in voluntary organizations varied by life cycle, religion, occupation, housing tenure and education. He also observed that the data indicated that the third hypothesis was too simplistic; the local-nonlocal axis is multi-dimensional. In effect, Foley (1952) presented evidence which failed to support Wirthian Postulates VI and VII identified earlier in Table 2.2.

Axelrod (1956:13-14) identified the following themes from Wirth (1938):

1. The impersonality of urban relationships (this approximates Postulate VI in Table 2.2).
2. The importance of formal and secondary group association (Postulates III and VII, Table 2.2).
3. The decline of kinship (Postulates I and VI, Table 2.2).

From his analysis of the Detroit Area Study, Axelrod (1956:16-18) found no evidence to support either of the above themes. A majority participated in formal group associations but not to the exclusion of primary relationships which varied positively together. This majority was not randomly distributed but was related to characteristics of education, occupation and income. Above all, association with relatives was found to be the most important type of informal group association.

Kasarda and Janowitz (1974:328) formulated two models of urban social behavior for empirical testing. The first, called the linear development model, assumed that linear increases of effects of size, density, and heterogeneity (derived from Toennies and Wirth) produced "a substitution of secondary for primary contacts, a weakening of the bonds of kinship, and a declining social significance of the local community". This is comparable to aspects of postulates VI and VII in Table 2.2.

The second, called (Kasarda and Janowitz,1974:329-330) the systemic model, holds that the local community contains complex systems of formal and informal social relations "rooted in family life and ongoing socialization processes" but influenced by mass society. This model focuses on length of residence as the "key exogenous factor influencing community behavior."

From their analysis of a national sample in England, Kasarda and Janowitz (1974:330-336) focused on testing discrete propositions to evaluate the two models rather than on a comprehensive multivariate analysis. They essentially found evidence strongly supporting the second model, that is, against Wirth. In particular, length of residence was the largest single predictor of formal organizational membership and, contrary to Wirth (Postulate VII, Table 2.2), the relationship was positive. Length of residence, age, and rural-urban location predicted informal socializing not the Wirthian Postulates VI and VII (Table 2.2).

Model 4 variables identified by the studies which tested Wirth (1938) are family life cycle (Model 1), home ownership, sex, education, occupation, income, religion, and length of residence. These variables are also identified by Larson (1938:388), Mather (1941:380-381), Rodehaver (1947: 54-56), Martin (1952:693;1953:78;1956:448-449), Reissman (1954:80), Foskett (1955:433-436), Zimmer (1955:219,221), Freedman (1956:59-60), Scott (1957:318-321), Townsend (1957: 125), Wright and Hyman (1958:287-292), Curtis (1959b:848), Zimmer and Hawley (1959:198-199), Curtis (1971: 874,877), Hyman and Wright (1971:197-202), and Sinclair and Westhues (1974:100). The studies cover a wide range of locations including national samples of England and the United States.

Other Model 4 variables including commuting, age, ethnicity, and house type were identified with organizational membership by Larson (1938:388), Rodehaver (1947:54-56), Foskett (1955: 433-436), Zimmer (1955:219,221), Martin (1956:448-449), Scott (1957:318-321), Townsend (1957:125), Wright and Hyman (1958:287-292), Zimmer and Hawley (1959:198-199), Curtis (1971:874,877), and Hyman and Wright (1971:197-202) across all types of locations. Leisure, religious participation, occupational status of head of household, number of children, number of cars, and working wife were not identified in these studies. But there is overwhelming empirical evidence to support the other variables in Model 4.

Martin (1952:693) and Scott (1957:321) also identified social class with organizational membership. Other variables were identified with organizational membership which were not specified in Model 4. These were not suitable for inclusion in other models. They include rural-urban location (Larson,1938:388;Zimmer and Hawley,1959:198), residential or occupational mobility (Rodehaver,1947:54-56; Martin,1952:693; Zimmer,1955:221; Curtis,1959b:848), farm-reared versus nonfarm-reared (Freedman,1956:56), and population size (Wright and Hyman,1958:290;Curtis,1971: 877). The last variable was not included as evidence for Model 3 as subcultures, also specified for Model 3, were not identified.

In summary, the majority of the variables specified under Model 4 is supported by a large number of empirical studies across a wide range of locations and methodologies.

Model 5, Distance Effects.

Only one study was found which specifically supported Model 5. Greer (1956:22), from a stratified sample in the Los Angeles area, reported that frequency of organizational membership increased with distance from the Central Business District (CBD). Two other studies, Rodehaver (1953) and Tallman and Morgner (1970), may be interpreted as support for Model 5. However, the latter study poses a methodological problem as noted below.

Rodehaver (1953:172) studied organizational membership of rural populations in Mississipi, Kentucky, Ohio, Illinois, and New York States. Although only rural populations were studied, distance from the Central Business District (CBD) appears to be a factor as residents in rural Mississipi, Kentucky and Ohio participate more than residents from Illinois or New York States. This seems to indicate a metropolitan influence from the North Eastern United States on the rural residents closer by.

Tallman and Morgner (1970:336-337) selected two areas for sampling in Minneapolis, one centrally located and the other in the suburbs, which may reasonably be interpreted as distance from CBD. They chose the two areas on the basis of their similarity in "income, occupational status, segregation, and geographical mobility rates." The effects of length of residence were controlled by sampling only those families resident in their present home between nine and eighteen months. Sampling was restricted to those families with at least one child in school to control stage in family life cycle. Tallman and Morgner (1970:338-340) found no relationship between location and organizational membership overall but found that increased church attendance in the suburbs varied by sex. They concluded that Wirth's (1938) ecological explanation does not adequately account for their results, in particular those related to social class and upward mobility.

Model 5 is supported by studies from a large city (Los Angeles) and from rural areas but not from a mid-sized city (Minneapolis). Tallman and Morgner (1970) limited their sampling by controlling length of residence and family life cycle. Their study also took place more than ten years after the other studies. Hence no firm conclusion is possible with regard to empirical support of Model 5.

Model 6. Contextual Effects.

Two studies, Bell and Boat (1957) and Greer and Kube (1959), support Model 6 using contextual variables not previously specified. Bell and Boat (1957:391-392) argue that Wirth's (1938) theory may apply to certain neighborhoods in the city but not in others. If this is the case, urban conditions need to be systematically appraised by relating "informal relations of urban residents to social types of neighborhoods." They interviewed male respondents in four San Francisco neighborhoods selected by high/low scores on indices of family status and economic status. Bell and Boat (1957:392) found that frequency of organizational attendance was positively related to family type and economic indicators of social types of neighborhoods.

From their results, Bell and Boat (1957:398) concluded that "the family and economic characteristics of an urban neighborhood may greatly influence the informal social relations of city residents." But they did not directly address the question of the implications of their findings on Wirth's (1938) postulates except to note that other future studies will "demonstrate the relevance of other conditions of the neighborhood." Implicit in this statement is their original contention that Wirth's (1938) postulates only apply in certain neighborhoods yet to be identified.

Greer and Kube (1959:94-95) observed that Wirth's (1938) method of conceptualizing urbanism and its effects was but one method among many. These methods were largely based on the interests of the investigator because the nature of the subject matter (urbanism) was largely unknown. Rather than using size, density and heterogeneity (Wirth,1938), Greer and Kube (1959:95-98) constructed measures of urbanism from census data which they used to select four neighborhoods similar in socio-economic status in Los Angeles. They noted that, despite this similarity, the four neighborhoods showed wide variation on their measure of urbanism based on fertility, women working and single family dwelling units.

From a random sample of residents in each neighborhood, Greer and Kube (1959:98,103) found that organizational membership, neighboring, and kinship visiting varied inversely with their urbanism index. That is, social participation (measured three ways) was positively associated with fertility and single family dwelling units and negatively with women working. They found no systematic relationship for socializing with friends. They concluded (1959:109-110) from their data that increasing urbanism is associated with increasing social participation, not only increased participation in voluntary organizations as postulated (VII, Table 2.2) by Wirth (1938).

Both studies represent possible operationalizations of social homogeneity and population density and hence, are considered supportive of Model 6.

In summary, from the foregoing literature review of empirical studies of organizational membership, support is demonstrated in varying degrees for Models 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6. Given no discernable bias in methodology, place of study, or operationalization of the dependent variable, no conclusion is possible, based on this evidence, about which model contains the strongest predictive capability. All models require testing at one time with all variables included in order to resolve the dilemma.

NEIGHBORING

Thirty-seven studies were reviewed which report original analysis or research focusing on the determinants or correlates of neighboring. These studies provide empirical evidence for all models. Measures of the dependent variable varied from the number of adults known by name in the immediate neighborhood and frequency of chatting with neighbors to perceptions or descriptions of neighbors or neighboring. No systematic variation was detected between results and type of sampling, location of study, or operationalization of the dependent variable.

Model 1, Social Homogeneity.

Of two studies which fall under Model 1, Litwak (1960a) supports the model on the basis of social class and Wayne (1972) does not. Litwak (1960a), in a non-random sample of Buffalo, New York, found that the frequency of socializing with neighbors increased with social class. Wayne (1972), in a systematic sample of Toronto, reported that social class was negatively related to neighboring (which was undefined). No studies were found which exclusively identified family life cycle under this model but the variable is identified in studies which fall under higher models and are described later.

Model 2, Environmental Choice.

Three studies, Caplow and Forman (1950), Lansing et al (1970), and Thorns (1975), provide partial support for this model as they specify variables associated with the physical as well as the social environment. The specification of the model, however, is incomplete in all three studies.

Caplow and Forman (1950), in a study controlling various physical features of housing in Minneapolis-St. Paul, found that scores on a neighboring scale increase with social "similarity" and type of residence. The highest scores occurred in single family dwellings, the lowest in apartments. A later study of ten new communities (Lansing et al,1970:116,120) found a similar result for house type with frequency of chatting with neighbors and the number of neighborhood adults known. Both types of neighboring also increased with increased neighborhood satisfaction.

A study of two suburbs of London, England (Thorns,1975:108-109), however, found that frequency of chatting with neighbors did not vary systematically with a combined measure of social class and type of planned or unplanned subdivision. But this result may be a function of the way in which social class was combined with the physical variable. Thus, we may conclude that Model 2 is partially supported by two studies from the United States while the English results, though not supportive of the model may be suspect for methodological reasons.

Model 3. Urbanism.

Model 3 was delineated by Fischer (1975). Controlling personal characteristics, social contact increases as a result of population concentration (size) and the presence of subcultures based on ethnicity, religion, or occupation. Fischer and Jackson (1976:291) reanalyzed the 1970 NORC study through a multivariate analysis and found that all three subcultural measures failed to appear significantly in the final regression equations.

Model 4. Personal Characteristics.

Nineteen studies were reviewed which supported Model 4. Five of these studies directly tested Wirth (1938) under Model 4. They are Foley (1952), Axelrod (1956), Fava (1958), Tomeh (1967), and Kasarda and Janowitz (1974).

In a study of neighboring in Rochester, New York, Foley[1] found (1952:36) that neighboring increased with propinquity, length of residence, presence of children in the home, social homogeneity, having relatives in the area, and no automobile. Foley's data failed to support Wirth (1938), Postulate VI, Table 2.2.

Axelrod's (1956:17) analysis[2] of the Detroit Area Study found no systematic relationship between social class, income, education, and frequent association with neighbors. As Axelrod found also that neighboring was the least important type of informal social contact, selection of the most frequent association may not have reflected the entire range of possible variation of that variable. A systematic relationship may exist with neighboring as a whole.

Attempting to discover if Wirth's (1938) postulates applied to suburbanism, Fava (1958) studied the extent of neighboring through random samples of three selected suburbs of New York City. She initially found (1958:124-128) that neighboring was associated with "settling down" factors of marriage, home ownership, length of residence, and age. But after statistically controlling sex, age, marital status, education, length of residence, nativity and community size, significant differences in neighboring were still attributable to place of residence. She further noted that neighboring decreases with distance from the city centre but the difference is still not accounted for solely in ecological terms: place is still significant. Hence, she concludes neighboring may be fostered by the selective migration of "rural survivals", the development of homogeneous sub-areas, and by city size, all of which may serve to increase rather than decrease informal contacts. Although Fava (1958) did not specifically test Wirthian postulates, her findings present evidence that, in contrast to Wirth's predictions, neighboring still occurs in some parts of the city.

---

[1] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 4, Organizational Membership.

[2] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 4, Organizational Membership.

Tomeh (1967:85) criticized Wirth's (1938) theoretical position on the basis that it exaggerated the postulated effects of urbanism especially with regard to the decline of informal social relations. The continued existence of informal social relations has been demonstrated by later researchers (e.g. Axelrod,1956;Dotson,1951). Tomeh (1967:86) selected four sources of informal association for testing: neighbors, relatives, co-workers, and other friends. The data were taken from three Detroit Area Studies, 1951-2, 1956-7, and 1958-9.

Tomeh found (1967:90), like Axelrod (1956), that high frequency of contact with one source is positively correlated with high frequency of contact with other sources. This evidence runs counter to Wirth's (1938) postulated replacement of primary by secondary contacts and weakening bonds of kinship. Participation in informal social relations also varied (Tomeh,1967:91) by age (negatively), marital status, presence of children, sex, and race. Tomeh noted, however, that the variation by sex was not sufficient to support the stereotyped notion that women participate informally more than men.

Another test found (Tomeh,1967:94-95) that levels of participation varied by education, income, and occupation. The greatest proportion of informal participation, with the sole exception of kinship, was maintained by middle and higher status persons. The highest rates of kinship participation are maintained by those with middle status. Tomeh also found (1967:98-99) that participation varied as well by religion and length of residence. This finding provides alternative evidence to Wirth (1938) (Postulates I, VI, Table 2.2). Tomeh concluded (1967:102) that the traditional view of urbanism applies to the inner zones of the city, but not to the city as a whole.

Kasarda and Janowitz[3] found (1974:334), from an analysis of English data, that neighboring was solely a function of length of residence, age, and rural/urban location based on population size. Again, this finding runs counter to Wirth's (1938) postulates (I, IV, Table 2.2).

Most of these variables were also found to be related to neighboring in a comprehensive data analysis by Fischer and Jackson (1976). They set out to test five theoretical positions using secondary analysis of two data sets: National Opinion Research Centre (NORC) and the Detroit Area Study (DAS).

---

[3] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 4, Organizational Membership.

The multivariate analysis of NORC data pertinent to this review showed (Fischer and Jackson,1976:291-295) that neighboring was most associated with city/suburb location, age, sex, education, occupation, income, ethnicity, religion, number of children, length of residence, house type, number of automobiles, and wife working. Their multivariate analysis of the DAS, however, showed that neighboring was largely explained by a contextual variable, income level of census tract. The latter finding is detailed under Model 6, but as the Model 4 findings resulted from a separate data set, they are considered supportive of Model 4.

The variables specified under Model 4 which are identified by those who tested Wirth (1938) include social homogeneity and marital status (Model 1), home ownership, age, sex, education, occupation, income, ethnicity, religion, number of children, length of residence, and number of cars. Fischer and Jackson (1976) identified all these variables except home ownership. Instead, they identified house type, which is similar in that the majority of owned homes are single family dwellings, and wife works. These variables are also identified by Kuper (1950:42-66), Wallin (1953:244-245), Foskett (1955:433-436), Martin (1956:449), Townsend (1957:121-123), Curtis (1959a:297), Dobriner (1963:118), Gans (1968:148), Pfeil (1968:157-158), Litwak and Szelenyi (1969:480-481), and Zito (1974:261). One other variable specified under Model 4, commuting, was identified by Martin (1956:448). Specified variables which were not empirically supported included leisure, religious participation, and occupational status.

Form et al's (1954:438-439) results provide something of an exception to the general findings. Form et al systematically sampled Lansing, Michigan, with a scale of social intimacy and attempted to match the subsequent maps of the intensity of social intimacy with ecological, demographic, and other social indices. They found (438) no simple linear relationship between the social scale map and maps of the other indices. The only systematic variation, non-linear, was with race and age of district.

Nine of the above studies also identified Model 1 variables with neighboring , Kuper (1950), Foley (1952), Wallin (1953), Smith et al (1954), Axelrod (1956), Townsend (1957), Fava (1958), Dobriner (1963), and Zito (1974). Other variables were identified as follows:- propinquity (Foley,1952; Cohen and Hodges, 1963; Gans,1968), occupational or residential mobility (Smith et al,1954; Curtis,1959a; Pfeil,1968), size of community (Fava,1958; Kasarda and Janowitz,1974), and presence of relatives in town (Foley,1952; Litwak and Szelenyi,1969; Lee,1979). Size of community was not suitable for inclusion in Model 3 as it lacked the subcultures specified.

In summary, a wide range of empirical support has been demonstrated for the majority of the variables specified under Model 4 irrespective of location, methodology, or the way in which the independent variable was operationalized.

Model 5. Distance Effects.

Distance from the CBD is the major explanatory variable in Model 5. Some studies were included under Model 5 on the basis of the way in which the key variable was operationalized rather than how it was reported or labelled by the author. Six studies are identified with this model including two, Key (1965) and Tallman and Morgner (1970), which directly tested Wirth (1938).

As reported earlier (Chapter III), Key (1965) surveyed a large sample of residents in the midwestern United States stratified by location of residence, rural village, small town, city, or metropolitan area, to test the 'neighboring decreasing with urbanism' postulate of Wirth (1938). He used a neighboring scale to measure the extent and quality of neighboring and city size to operationalize urbanism. His data (384) support the above postulate with significant differences between places (Chi Sqare, p <.001) even when controlling for age and sex. A non-significant interaction between socio-economic status and sex is indicated, however, so rural males and urban females show higher rates of neighboring.

Tallman and Morgner's (1970:338) study[4] unequivocally supports the Wirthian postulate identified above. A difference by sex noted in their data is accounted for by the increased amount of friendship relations shared by city males which appears to compensate for lower levels of neighboring. These results are supported by other studies in different places, at different times with different measures.

In a study of recent movers into the rural-urban fringe around Milwaukee, Dewey (1948:121-122) found that perception of neighboring was a function of family life cycle and locating in a new subdivision (in effect, further away from the CBD). Greer (1956:22) reported a relationship between high/low urbanism and neighboring in Los Angeles. The census tracts selected for sampling to represent high/low urbanism also happen to be closer or further from the CBD. From a partial analysis of the Detroit Area Study, Tomeh (1964:34) found locality, age, marital status, education, and native to town correlated with neighboring. Locality was based on inner city, outer city, and suburbs, in effect, distance from CBD. Clark (1966:185) in his study of Toronto suburbs observed that increased neighboring was associated with newer suburbs and distance from the CBD.

The studies that tested Wirth (1938) supported his postulates which differ slightly from the specification of

---

[4] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 5, Organizational Membership.

Model 5. The other four authors support the model.

Model 6, Contextual Effects.

The results of six out of seven studies support Model 6 although some of the contextual variables employed are not always those specified in the model. Of these studies, three, Bell and Boat (1957), Greer and Kube (1959), and Fox et al (1980), tested Wirth (1938). Bell and Boat (1957:394) found[5] that frequency of socializing with neighbors was positively related to family type and social class indicators of neighborhoods constructed from census data. Greer and Kube (1959:103) found[6] that neighboring increased with two neighborhood measures constructed from census data--fertility and single family dwellings--but decreased with a third similarly constructed measure of women working.

Fox, Fox and Marans (1980:350) summarized Wirth (1938) by stating that Wirth's exploration of the effect of increasing urbanization "involved propositions about the ways in which environmental factors affect social interaction." They noted that subsequent survey data and community studies had demonstrated not only that urbanites typically socialize informally but that this socializing may even increase with density. They argued that Wirth's theory "invokes global characteristics of large units (cities) to explain social dynamics that correspond to smaller units

---

[5] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 6, Organizational Membership.

[6] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 6, Organizational Membership.

(e.g. neighborhoods)."

Fox et al (1980:352-353) hypothesized that "as external density (and passive contacts among neighbors) increases, the likelihood that neighbors will form relationships will increase if public open space is available in their blocks." In testing this hypothesis, their goal was to test Wirth at the neighborhood level using data from the 1972 National Quality of Life Reinterview Survey of 285 respondents over 18 years of age.

The analysis showed (Fox et al,1980:357-358) that environmental variables, external density and public open space, interact to positively affect neighboring "even when other factors are held constant." Although they admit the relationship is not strong, it does run counter to Wirth (Postulate II, Table 2.2).

Four other studies, Bernard (1937), Nohara (1968), Fischer and Jackson (1976), and Fischer (1981), were also identified under Model 6. Bernard (1937:146-156) reported children at home, home ownership, house type, and residential mobility related to neighboring. The physical variables would indicate nominal support for Model 2. Bernard also reported that population density and the proportion of persons over 65 years of age in the neighborhood was related to neighboring. This finding qualifies as support for Model 6.

Nohara (1968:183-185) found that, in addition to personal characteristics of home ownership, marital status, and length of residence, variables from census data, family type, socioeconomic status, and race, were related to increased neighboring. These variables were used to select neighborhoods for sampling and as such contain a common element with the contextual effects specified for Model 6.

In an analysis of the DAS, following support of Model 4 discussed above, Fischer and Jackson (1976:298-299) found that tract income was the best predictor of a neighboring scale. In another later study of San Francisco, Fischer (1981:309) defined urbanism as proximity to concentrations of people. This definition is assumed to be equivalent (in terms of its effects) to population density and hence, falls under Model 6. However, unlike most studies reviewed here, Fischer (1981:315) used distrust of neighbors rather than social contact and reported that urbanism was not associated with distrust of neighbors but with distrust of others. This finding may not be supportive of Model 6, but may be the result of the different research focus.

In summary, empirical support demonstrates the importance of contextual variables but not all variables receiving support are specified by the model. The negative relationship between neighboring and women working makes intuitive sense although it is not predicted in the model.

The foregoing review of the empirical literature on neighboring shows clear support for Model 4 and partial support for Models 1, 2, 5, and 6. With no detectable systematic variation between results, methodology, place of study, or operationalization of the independent variable, it is not possible to draw a conclusion about the strongest predictive model. To do that, the models require simultaneous testing with all variables included at one time.

SOCIALIZING WITH KIN

The following reviews of twenty-six studies report original analysis or research focusing on the determinants or correlates of socializing with kin. Support is documented for Models 1, 2, 4 and 6. Some support for Model 5 is present but equivocal. No research testing Model 3 was uncovered.

Measures of the dependent variable included measures of frequency of interaction with kin as well as exchanges of help. No systematic variation was detected between the results, the locations studied, the dependent variable, or the method of sampling except for one study. The results from a non-random sample of Boston (Mogey:1977) may constitute a bias in that its results run counter, to some extent, to the balance of studies in Model 4.

Model 1, Social Homogeneity.

Four studies produced results which support Model 1 but one study did not. Litwak (1960a:19), using a non-random sample of middle class families in Buffalo, found that socializing with relatives was a function of social class:

the higher the social class, the greater the amount of socializing with relatives. This finding is supported by Cohen and Hodges (1963:309-310) in a study of San Francisco and neighboring counties and by Gordon and Noll (1975:242-243) in a study of United States metropolitan areas.

Shanas (1967:266) analyzed nationwide probability samples (n = about 2,500) of persons over 65 of age in each of Denmark, Great Britain, and the United States. She found that help received from relatives is a function of social class and family life cycle. But in a systematic sample of Toronto, Wayne (1972:90) found that kinship participation was negatively related to social class; kinship participation was higher among lower class people. Since Wayne (1972) used a neighborhood measure of social class, his work is also included under Model 6.

One possible conclusion, given the strong empirical support for this model, is that people are different in Toronto, Canada, from those in the United States and Europe. Lacking further details of Wayne's methodology, no other conclusion is reasonable.

Model 2. Environmental Choice.

One study was identified which supports Model 2. Thorns (1975:103), in a study of two suburbs of London, England, classified respondents by social class. He used a combined measure of occupation and district, ranging from middle class planned residential to working class unplanned industrial. His results for visiting relatives show no systematic variation but when the results from industrial districts are set aside, the classification of residential districts and social class vary inversely with visiting relatives: the lower the social class and the less planned the residential district, the higher the visiting. The exclusion of the industrial districts may be justified on the basis of small numbers. This finding, i.e., an inverse relationship between class and kinship participation, also provides support for the exception reported above (Wayne,1972) in Model 1.

Without further specification of the construction of the independent variable, it is not possible to evaluate Thorns' finding except to observe that it may be an artifact of the methodology.

Model 4. Personal Characteristics.

The majority of twenty studies reviewed support Model 4. No systematic variation was detected between their results and specification of dependent variables but some bias is noted with place of study. All of the studies, except Adams (1968), took place in large cities, entire counties, or at the national level. Adams (1968) specifically examined a mid-sized city, Greensboro, North Carolina, but no studies examined small towns, villages, or rural areas alone. In addition, bias may exist as a result of method of sampling. One study, Mogey (1977), failed to show support for Model 4. He used the largest number of variables in a non-random sample of Boston. It is reviewed later under this model.

Four of the twenty studies, Axelrod (1956), Tomeh (1967), Adams (1968), and Kasarda and Janowitz (1974), directly tested Wirth (1938). Axelrod's (1956:16-17) analysis[7] of the Detroit Area Study found that frequency of socializing with relatives varies curvilinearly with family income and education. People with low and high levels of income and education socialize least with relatives. Those with middle levels of income and education socialize most. He also reported that socializing with relatives was the most important type of informal relationship, followed by friendship and neighboring in that order.

Tomeh[8] found (1967:91,94-95) that participation in informal social relations varied by age (negatively), marital status, presence of children, sex, and race. Further analysis shows that education was positively related to socializing with relatives while income and occupation were curvilinearly related. Socializing with relatives was also related to religion and length of residence.

In an extensive review of the literature on urban kinship, Adams (1968:2-3) argued that primary relationships, including kin, continue to exist among urbanites, Wirth's (1938) assertions to the contrary. It is not a lesser amount of primary social contact in the city compared to the country, but a greater amount of secondary contacts. Adams (1968:6) addressed the question of how kin networks articulated with other social systems in a large stratified sample of Greensboro, North Carolina. He found (1968:38) that frequency of kin interaction varied by sex and distance between kin such that visiting varied inversely with distance. Distance continued to be a factor, but less so, when frequency of kin interaction was controlled by occupational status and mobility (Adams,1968:43-44).

---

[7] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 4, Organizational Membership.

[8] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 4, Neighboring.

Adams concluded (1968:169) that the ideas of decreasing kinship association and weakening bonds of kinship were not supported by his study. Kin contact varied by sex, occupational status and mobility. Distance between relatives was a qualifier rather than a deterrent. Where distance was greater, other forms of contact such as letter or telephone were more frequent.

Kasarda and Janowitz[9] (1974) conducted an extensive analysis of a national sample of England. They found (1974:334) that socializing with kin was related to length of residence, age, and rural/urban location based on population size, a finding not in accord with Wirth's (1938) postulates (I, VI, Table 2.2).

The variables specified under Model 4 identified by those who tested Wirth (1938) included social class and marital status (Model 1), age, sex, education, occupation, income, ethnicity, religion, number of children, and length of residence. These variables were also identified by Townsend (1957:119), Litwak and Szelenyi (1969:480-481), Gibson (1972:20-21), and Lee (1979:46,51;1980:926-930). Two studies, Mogey (1977) and Reiss (1962), did not support the above findings but both results may be questioned for reasons of sampling.

---

[9] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 4, Organizational Membership.

Mogey (1977:415-417) was not primarily concerned with correlates of social contact. He was interested in the type and quality of relations between relatives rather than the determinant social cause of those relations. Moreover, his research was based on a comprehensive secondary analysis of a non-random sample of male veterans in Boston. This, in effect, eliminated age as a variable from the study.

Mogey (1977:417-425) reported that patterns of kin interaction are not significantly related to age, ethnicity, education, occupation, social class, social mobility, or religion. Therefore, he states, "kinship relations are not significantly influenced by these measures of other social structures. This finding extends the reports in the literature that kinship, friendship and neighboring are independent social systems to the statement that kinship is also independent of major social structures."

After factor analyzing types of kin relationships, Mogey concluded (1977:425) that kin interaction is negatively related to distance between kin and is also a function of stage in family life cycle peaking with family formation, home ownership, and young child rearing.

Although Mogey's (1977) findings may be set aside on the basis of the nonrandom sample, some of his conclusions are supported in an earlier study (Reiss,1962). From a study of a middle class sample in Boston, Reiss (1962:338) concluded that socializing with kin was not related to family life cycle, sex, or ethnicity. It was a function of the degree of kin relationship, distance between kin, and, perhaps, social class. Reiss' (1962) findings, however, may also be set aside on the basis of sampling especially when two of the variables crucial to determining social class (education and income) were earlier shown (Axelrod:1956:17) to be curvilinearly related to socializing with kin.

One other variable specified under Model 4, number of cars, was identified by Pineo (1964:144-145) in a random sample of working class people in Hamilton, Ontario. Model 4 variables not identified include commuting, leisure, religious participation, home ownership, occupational status, house type, and wife works.

In addition to the specified variables, several studies variously identified variables specified under Model 1: social class (Sussman,1953:27-28;Townsend,1957:119), social class and family life cycle (Sussman and Burchinal,1962:236; Pineo,1964: 144-145;Lee,1980:927,930), and family life cycle (Gibson,1972: 20-21;Irving,1972: 60).

Variables not specified under Model 4 were included as follows: residential mobility (Gist,1952:332), type of help received or given (Sussman,1953:27-28;Sharp and Axelrod,1956:438-439;Litwak and Szelenyi,1969: 480-481), the move to suburbs (Bell,1956:283;1958:247), distance from relatives (Sharp and Axelrod,1956:438-439;Reiss,1962:338; Sussman and Burchinal,1962: 237;Litwak and Szelenyi,1969: 480-481; Mogey,1977:425;Lee,1979:51;1980:928), the degree of kin relationship (Reiss,1962:338), emotional reliance on kin (Irving,1972:48-51), size of population (Kasarda and Janowitz,1974:334), and social mobility (Lee,1980:927).

The results from two studies present some evidence contrary to the above findings. From a systematic sample of Buffalo, New York, Litwak (1960b:393) found that kin ties were not affected by distance from relatives even for recent movers. Mogey (1977:425) found that the rate of social mobility was not related to kinship association.

Given the findings reviewed above, support for Model 4 is not clearly demonstrated without making assumptions about certain studies, but the range of empirical evidence is strongly in favour of Model 4.

Model 5. Distance Effects.

The major explanatory variable under Model 5 is distance from the CBD: that is, socializing with kin increases with distance from CBD. Some of the studies were included under Model 5 on the basis of the way in which the key variable was operationalized rather than how it was labelled by the author. Six studies were identified with Model 5. Three of these tested Wirth (1938). Two studies

(Garigue,1956;Key,1961) fail to support the model and one (Tallman and Morgner,1970) provides support.

Garigue (1956) addressed Wirth's (1938) postulated decreasing kinship association and weakening bonds of kinship resulting from increasing urbanism (postulates I and VI, Table 2.2), in a study of French Canadians in Montreal. He found (1956:1092,1099) that kinship association and knowledge of kin was widely scattered throughout the Province of Quebec and beyond and had not diminished greatly over time. Garigue concluded (1956:1100) that this was a cultural phenomenon distinct from the effects of urbanism postulated in the United States. As such, it raises questions about the universality of Wirth's postulates and suggests that his theory may be culture-specific or perhaps unique to the United States alone.

Testing the same postulates as Garigue (1956), Key (1961:53) surveyed a large sample of residents in the mid-western United States stratified by location of residence (rural, village, small town, city, metropolitan area) and population size, using a kinship participation scale. His findings (1961:54-55) do not support family disintegration as a result of increasing urbanism (Postulates I, VI, Table 2.2).

Tallman and Morgner's (1970:341,344) findings[10] with respect to kinship relations support Model 5 with independent variation also due to sex and social class. Three other studies support Model 5, Greer (1956:22), Tomeh (1964:34), and Winch and Greer (1968:45). In addition, Tomeh (1964:34) identified marital status (Model 1), age, education, and town native (Model 4); Winch and Greer (1968:45) identified social class (Model 1), ethnicity, and length of residence (Model 4).

---

[10] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 5, Organizational Membership.

A bias may exist with regard to place of study. Model 5 is supported by studies in greater Los Angeles (Greer,1956), Detroit (Tomeh,1964), towns and villages in Wisconsin (Winch and Greer,1968), and urban-suburban Minneapolis (Tallman and Morgner,1970). It is not supported by studies in Montreal (Garigue,1956) or rural to urban mid-western United States (Key,1961). As the latter study (Key,1961) represents a more complete test across a wider range of locations, it may be concluded that model 5 is not unambiguously supported.

Model 6, Contextual Effects.

Three studies, Bell and Boat (1957), Greer and Kube (1959), and Wayne (1972), support Model 6 using variables other than those specified. Bell and Boat[11] found (1957:334) that frequency of socializing with relatives was positively related to family type and social class indicators of social types of neighborhoods constructed from census data. Moreover, in comparing results, they found that the relationship for relatives was stronger than that for neighbors which, in turn, was stronger than that for friends. One would have thought that this finding would have been strongest for neighbors on the assumption that friends and relatives should not really be affected by the type of neighborhood unless they were all living in the same area.

---

[11] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 6, Organizational Membership.

Greer and Kube[12] found (1959:103) that socializing with relatives increased with two neighborhood measures constructed from census data--fertility and single family dwellings--but decreased with a third similarly constructed measure of women working.

Contrary to Bell and Boat (1957), Wayne (1972:90), from his Toronto study,[13] found that kinship participation was inversely related to a measure of neighborhood social class: the lower the neighborhood social class, the higher the participation. This relationship is in the same direction as that for individual social class.

As the direction of relationships in Model 6 was not formally established, it may be noted that Model 6 is empirically supported with contextual variables other than those specified but the direction of the relationship appears to be specific to the place of study.

In summary, the foregoing review of empirical studies of socializing with kin showed support in varying degrees for all models except Model 3. Some studies did not support Models 4, 5, and 6, hence firm conclusions about those models are not possible. As no overall conclusion can be drawn with respect to the best predictor of socializing with kin, all models require testing at one time to resolve the problem.

---

[12] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 6, Organizational Membership.

[13] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 1, Neighboring.

SOCIALIZING WITH FRIENDS

Eighteen studies are reviewed which report original analyses or research focusing on determinants or correlates of socializing with friends. Support was documented for Models 4 and 5, and partial support for Models 1, 2, and 6. One study failed to support Model 3. Overall, no systematic variation was detected between the results of the studies, measures of the dependent variable, or the locations studied except where noted in Model 1. Operationalization of the dependent variable varied from frequency of socializing with friends, used in most studies, to numbers of friends, and perception and descriptions of friendship relations.

Model 1, Social Homogeneity.

Two studies were identified under Model 1, Wayne (1972) and Gordon and Noll (1975). In a study of the Borough of East York in Toronto, Wayne (1972:90) examined individual and contextual effects based on social class and family life cycle. His results are reported under Models 1 and 6 in order to balance the reporting of overall results. He found that friendship participation decreases with stage in the family life cycle. As East Yorkers reached later stages in the life cycle, their friendship participation diminished. This relationship was not specified in more detail so it is not possible to assess whether the decline is gradual over the life cycle or changes suddenly with the achievement of a certain stage.

Gordon and Noll's (1975) report was based on a secondary analysis of the 1963 NORC data covering United States metropolitan areas. They found (1975:243) that contact with friends and the number of friends are positively correlated with social class indexed by education, occupation, and income.

On the basis of this evidence alone, no conclusion can be drawn regarding Model 1. The study with the broadest areal coverage (NORC) supports Model 1 on the basis of social class but a study with a narrower areal focus (Toronto) failed to support Model 1 on the basis of family life cycle.

Model 2. Environmental Choice.

One study which provides partial support of Model 2 is based on a social survey of two suburbs in London, England. Thorns (1975:108-109) found that frequency of social contact with friends was positively related to a combined measure of social class and the physical characteristics of the neighborhood based on the extent of planning and the predominant residential type. The part of this model concerned with values and perceptions was not covered in Thorn's study.

Model 3. Urbanism.

The specifications of Model 3 originates with Fischer (1975). Controlling for personal characteristics, social contact increases as a result of population concentration (size) and the presence of subcultures based on ethnicity, religion, or occupation. Guterman's (1969) was the only study identified with Model 3 and his results fail to support this model.

Guterman's (1969:492-493) is one of the few studies which defended Wirth (1938) on the basis that Wirth's postulates had not been correctly operationalized in tests of urban and rural populations. From a stratified random sample of white collar hotel employees in 26 hotels operated by two chains between Washington, D.C., and Bangor, Maine, Guterman (1969:495) found that intimacy of friendship ties varied inversely with population size.

By sampling an occupational subculture without a sample of the general population, it may be argued that Guterman directly tested the model. If a relationship between a subculture and social contact does not exist for a specified subculture, it is irrelevant to test the general population. A complete test of the model, however, would require the identification and testing of a number of different subcultures in more than one city.

Model 4. Personal Characteristics.

Eleven studies largely support Model 4. No systematic variation between the findings and the operationalization of the dependent variable could be discerned. A bias exists, however, due to place of study. No studies which specifically examined rural areas, small towns, or villages, were identified. This is offset to some extent by national samples (e.g. Fischer and Jackson,1976). A bias may also exist with regard to the selection of variables included in studies using multivariate analysis. Fischer and Jackson (1976) tabulated a much wider range of independent variables in the United States than Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) did for England.

Four of the eleven studies, Smith, Form and Stone (1954), Axelrod (1956), Tomeh (1967), and Kasarda and Janowitz (1974), directly tested Wirth (1938). Smith et al (1954:276) argued that the theoretical point of view formulated by sociologists such as Wirth (1938) failed to account for the complexity of urban life and the persistence of "significant primary relationships" in the city. The demonstrated existence of friendship relationships (not postulated by Wirth specifically) requires a "reformulation of urban theory." Hence, they undertook a systematic sampling of Lansing, Michigan to ascertain the extent of friendship and its correlates in the city.

They found (1974:279-284) a positive relationship between social class and local intimate friendship. In terms of number of moves, local friendship was negatively related to residential mobility and positively related to length of residence. These last two findings were reversed for city-wide friendship ties. That is, city-wide friendship was positively related to mobility and negatively related to length of residence. Smith et al's study may not be construed as a direct test of Wirth (1938) since he did not specifically mention friendship. But their findings do present counter evidence to several of Wirth's (1938) postulates. At the local level, intimate ties have not been replaced by voluntary organizations (Postulates VI, III, VII, Table 2.2), while at the city-wide level, increased mobility has not produced its postulated effects (III, IV, Table 2.2).

Axelrod's (1956:17) analysis[14] of the Detroit Area Study found a moderate positive relationship between social class, family income, education and socializing with friends. Tomeh (1967:91) found, from an analysis[15] of three Detroit Area Studies, that social participation with friends varied by age (negatively), marital status, presence of children, sex, and race. A further test found (Tomeh,1967:94) that socializing with friends also varied by education, income, and occupation. The highest rates of participation occurred among middle and higher status persons.

Kasarda and Janowitz found (1974:334), in a multivariate analysis of English data,[16] that socializing with friends was solely a function of length of residence, age, and population size. But a later multivariate analysis of United States data (Fischer and Jackson, 1976) confirmed nearly all of the findings of those who tested Wirth (1938).

---

[14] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 4, Organizational Membership.
[15] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 4, Neighboring.

Fischer and Jackson's (1976) analysis of the 1965-1966 Detroit Area Study[17] is repeated here (it also appears under Model 6 below) to illustrate a higher level of statistical analysis for a larger number of independent variables than those shown by Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) above. Fischer and Jackson's (1976:299) data show that socializing with friends is most associated with age, number of children at home, wife working, occupational prestige, ethnicity, religion, length of residence (Model 4) and tract income (Model 6). Due to lack of published detail, the direction of these relationships cannot be determined.

The variables specified under Model 4, that is, the variables identified by those who tested Wirth, include age, sex, education, occupation, income, ethnicity, religion, number of children, and length of residence. These variables are also identified by Townsend (1957:121,123), Curtis (1959a:297), Sutcliffe and Crabbe (1963:66-67), Gans (1968:148,152), Litwak and Szelenyi (1969:480-481), Lee (1979:46), and Fischer and Jackson (1976:299). Two other variables, occupational status and wife works, specified under Model 4, were identified by Fischer and Jackson (1976:299).

---

[16] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 4, Organizational Membership.

[17] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 4, Neighboring.

No studies were found which empirically tested commuting, leisure, religious participation, home ownership, house type, and number of cars with socializing with friends. Four of the eleven studies, Axelrod (1956:17), Townsend (1957:121,123), Tomeh (1967:91), and Gans (1968:152), also identified Model 1 variables with socializing with friends. Other variables were identified with Model 4 as follows: residential mobility (Smith et al,1959:282), occupational mobility (Curtis,1959a:297), type of help and distance from relatives (Litwak and Szelenyi (1969:480-481), and population size (Kasarda and Janowitz,1974:334). Population density was found not to be related to friendship association in Sydney, Australia (Sutcliffe and Crabbe,1963:66-67).

In summary, a large number of variables specified under Model 4 are empirically supported across a wide range of measures and locations. Lack of detail in the reporting of certain studies hinders the interpretation of some contrary findings.

Model 5, Distance Effects.

Two studies support Model 5. Greer (1956:22), from a study of greater Los Angeles, reported that low urban/high urban varies negatively with the proportion of respondents having local friends. The proportion of respondents with local friends increases as urbanization decreases. As the measure of urbanization includes distance from CBD, a positive association with friendship is indicated. One final study in Detroit (Tomeh,1967:31) reported that frequency of contact with friends was positively related to distance from the CBD, but after controls were entered (age, marital status, education, and town native), the strength of the relationship with distance was reduced.

Model 6, Contextual Effects.

Five studies using different contextual variables failed to completely support Model 6. Two studies,[18] Bell and Boat (1957) and Greer and Kube (1959), directly tested Wirth (1938). Bell and Boat (1957:394) found a moderate positive relationship between socializing with friends and family type and social class indicators of social types of neighborhoods constructed from census data. Greer and Kube (1959:103) found no relationship between socializing with friends and other measures of neighborhood constructed from census data including fertility ratio, single family dwellings and women working.

Wayne (1972:90), in the study mentioned under Model 1, found that neighborhood class and familism contextual measures had no effect on the extent of socializing with friends. Fischer and Jackson (1976:298), from a multivariate analysis of the Detroit Area Study, concluded that the proportion of youth in the census tract was positively related to the proportion of best friends in the neighborhood. In a later study of the San Francisco area, however, Fischer (1981:315) found that urbanism (based on proximity to concentrations of people, construed here to represent contextual population density) does not "produce estrangement from close associates."

---

[18] Reviewed in detail earlier under Model 6, Organizational Membership.

Two conclusions are possible. One might conclude that Model 6 is supported, if the most powerful statistical analysis (Fischer and Jackson,1976) is taken as the criteria. The other conclusion is that the effectiveness of Model 6 in 'explaining' social contact with friends rests only on the particular contextual variable selected.

In summary, the foregoing literature review shows a remarkable consensus. Most variables are concerned with personal attributes and demographic variables rather than with variables connected with place of residence. This does not explain, however, which variables have the highest level of association. Moreover, Kasarda and Janowitz's (1974) results demonstrated that social class and population density are not significantly related to socializing with friends. Unfortunately, they did not test all other variables.

The above review shows that all of the models are not unequivocally supported. In fact, Model 3 is not supported at all. As long as studies continue to employ descriptive statistics and a few variables, conclusions about the best predictive model will remain elusive.

Summary of Models by Type of Social Contact

Organizational Membership. In summary, the foregoing review of empirical studies of organizational membership supports Models 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 in varying degrees. Given the empirical evidence and the nature of most of the analyses, it is not possible to draw conclusions about the relative merits of each model or even of the strongest model. All models require testing at one time with all variables included in a multivariate analysis in order to resolve the problem.

Neighboring. The foregoing literature review of empirical tests of neighboring show partial support for Models 1, 2, 5, and 6 and clear support for Model 4. Again, no conclusion is possible about which is the best model in terms of prediction due to the nature of the data reported and the methods of analyses.

Socializing with Kin. All of the models, except Model 3, received some support in the foregoing review on socializing with kin. Some studies showed no support for Models 4, 5, and 6. Hence, only Models 1 and 2 were fully supported. But again, no conclusion is possible about which model is the best predictor.

Socializing with Friends. The above review of empirical tests of socializing with friends show no unequivocal support for any model and in fact, Model 3 remains unsupported.

By way of summary, it has been repeatedly emphasized that all models require testing with all variables against all four types of social contact at one time in a multivariate analysis.

Summary of Models across Types of Social Contact

In each particular model as it was used to screen empirical studies under different types of social contact, we find little conclusive empirical evidence.
Model 1 was supported under each type of social contact on the basis of social class. But there are negative findings for social class with neighboring and with socializing with kin. Family life cycle was supported under socializing with kin, but not under socializing with friends.

Only partial support was found for Model 2. Most studies did not include attitudes, values, and/or physical variables. Empirical evidence under socializing with kin was questionable. One study was identified with Model 3 under socializing with friends but this study offered negative findings.

Model 4 was widely supported for the majority of specified variables. This appears to be an accurate reflection of the empirical interest over the past thirty years. Over half of the empirical studies are atheoretical. That is, a theory was not explicitly identified in the published report of the study. Many of the variables tested were the result of individual speculation about the nature and/or existence of primary social contact in urban, suburban, and small town settings. Variables such as age, sex, education, etc. also reflect an earlier concern with aggregate data collected through the census.

Support for Model 5 was questionable under all types of social contact except one. This exception is negative. Socializing with kin received no empirical support at all. Model 6 was supported under organizational membership and neighboring but not under socializing with kin or socializing with friends.

The fact that Model 4 received the greatest amount of empirical support could easily lead to an erroneous conclusion about the models. It is more a reflection of the focus of research interest than the result of systematic testing.

There is very little evidence in the empirical literature reviewed above to support the scientific notion of systematic testing of relationships. Independent variables found significant in earlier studies were ignored in later studies, in some cases, due to the use of secondary analysis of existing data. Evidence from the references cited in many studies demonstrates incomplete reviews of the empirical literature. Hence, the choice of independent variables has been more the product of incomplete review and/or circumstance (secondary analysis) than it has been the product of systematic analysis. Moreover, no conclusion is possible regarding the relative statistical strength and predictive capability of each model. That may only be decided in a complete test of all models using all the variables at one time.

Inherent in this logic, however, is the assumption that one or other of the models will significantly and meaningfully correlate with social contact. The possibility exists that none of the models will work, or, that too many models will be significant in any one location. If this study were proceeding from a stronger theoretical base, one might speculate that a different model would be specified for each type of social contact irrespective of place. As most of the variables reviewed have been associated with more than one type of social contact, such an individualistic specification is not likely to be found. Any problems will be discussed as they arise in the analysis. We now turn to a discussion of some of the methodological problems associated with testing the six models in an existing data set.

VI. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction.

The foregoing literature review has demonstrated the need to test all six models simultaneously. This involves examining the variables specified under them, and any other variables found to be relevant in the empirical literature, in order to identify the determinants of four types of social contact. No conclusions may be drawn about the relative merits of various models or variables until they are tested at one time. Multivariate analysis is an appropriate test.

It was recommended by Guterman (1969) that the models be tested in as wide a range of locations as possible. Marshall (1973) suggests that the models be tested at three levels of urban scale: downtown, suburb, and small town. The small town is readily identified with a meaningful boundary which separates it from its rural surrounds. The use of a small town sample is also advocated by Prior (1968). Prior (1968:206-208) argues that the small town on the rural--urban fringe is the chosen location of a population with specific demographic characteristics. It is this which gives the small town a unique character distinct from the city itself. Such a range of locations is available from two social surveys completed in 1977: the Edmonton Area Study (EAS) and the Leduc Area Study (LAS). A large proportion of the quality of life and demographic questions used in the

EAS were replicated in the LAS. Taken together, the data from these two studies provide most of the variables specified under the six models. This chapter will focus on a number of methodological and analytical issues associated with using these data for that purpose.

Sample Selection

The 1977 Edmonton Area Study sample was drawn from the June 1, 1976, edition of the Edmonton Telephones Street Numerical Address Directory (Kennedy et al,1977:6-7) This afforded the most complete usable listing of the population of Edmonton available at that time. The sampling unit was a household with a telephone listed in the Directory. In a household occupied by a family, one of the spouses was selected as the respondent. In a non-family household, respondents were selected from persons over 18 years of age. The sex of the respondent was determined by interviewers first requesting a male respondent until sufficient were obtained to balance male and female representation. In order to increase precision while reducing costs and time, the 1977 EAS (Kennedy et al,1977:7) used a "multi-stage area cluster design with stratification, probability proportional to size, and equal probability of selection of each household."

The Leduc Area Study was sponsored by the town's Preventive Social Services Program and conducted by the present author during the year 1977. The sample was drawn via a systematic selection of one in ten residential lots from a total listing of all town lots. Households were the unit of study as in the EAS and a similar procedure was followed in the selection of respondents.

Sampling Procedure

The description of the sampling procedure for the 1977 EAS is taken from Kennedy et al (1977:8-9):-

> Stage 1. All 1971 enumeration areas (EA's) were identified and special EA's such as hospitals, nurses residences, nursing homes, hotels, and military establishments were excluded. These EA's were then stratified by deciles according to average total family income; that is, the first stratum was identified so about contain the 10% of the EA's with the lowest average total family income levels, and so on. An additional stratum was made up of newly built areas since 1971. One-tenth of the EA's in each stratum was then randomly selected with probability proportional to size, that is, an EA with twice the number of households of another EA was given twice the chance of being selected.
>
> Stage 2. The number of interviews assigned each stratum was determined according to the proportion of the population in that stratum; that is, if a stratum contained 9% of the households then it was assigned 9% or 36 of the 400 interviews. The households to be interviewed were divided equally among the EA's chosen in Stage 1 to represent the stratum; that is, if the stratum contained 6 EA's then each EA was assigned 36/6 = 6 interviews. The households to be interviewed from each EA were chosen systematically from the July 1976 Edmonton Street Address Numerical Directory by taking a random start between 1 and j inclusive and selecting every jth household where j is the total number of households in the EA divided by the number of households to be selected.
>
> Stage 3. The respondent was chosen by the interviewer's asking for the male head of the household for the first 33% of the assigned households in each EA. Thereafter either the male or the female head of the household was taken.

The only listing of Leduc in 1977 which contained all the population of the town was a map of residential lots, numbered by subdivisions. A one in ten systematic sample of all lots was initiated with a random start. One area of the town originally contained blocks of ten residential lots. Demolition of houses, vacant lots, and commercial building eliminated the problem of monotonic ordering. Apartment buildings were physically enumerated and a one in ten sample of occupied apartments was also initiated with a random start. Selection of respondents followed the procedure outlined in Stage 3 of the EAS.

Data Collection

Following pretesting of the survey instruments in both surveys, interview data were collected through personal interviews conducted at the respondents' residence mostly during evenings and weekends by similarly trained interviewers. This resulted in 341 completed interviews (85 percent response rate) in Edmonton and 259 completed interviews (92 percent response rate) in Leduc.

Dependent Variables

As noted earlier (Chapter VI), the major reason for keeping the four types of social contact distinct is the unique finding (Rosow,1967:219) that one type of social contact cannot compensate for another, although there may be some overlap. This finding is supported by Mogey's observation (1977:421) that kinship, friendship, and neighboring are independent systems. Other findings (Shulman,1967b:158; Wellman,1979: 1214) indicate that the type of help and the type of socializing actually vary by type of social contact. Until this connection is documented further, it will be necessary to examine the four types of social contact separately.

The four types of social contact (organizational membership, neighboring, socializing with relatives, and socializing with friends) were measured in a similar way in both studies. Under organizational membership, respondents were asked to identify the types of organizations (fraternities, service clubs, etc.) to which they belonged. The operationalization of organizational membership in this fashion was also used by 31 out of 37 studies reviewed earlier (Chapter V). For the purposes of the present analysis, the variable was recoded none=0 and one or more=1.

Two measures were available for neighboring, the number of neighborhood adults known and frequency of chatting with neighbors. The voluntary aspect of chatting with neighbors appears to be closer to other types of social contact than the number of neighborhood adults known. As several studies reviewed earlier (Chapter V) used the number of neighborhood adults known as a dependent variable, it was decided to use both variables to test the models in the present study. The number of neighborhood adults known was coded all to none on a seven-point scale (all=1, none=7). A similar measure was used by seven out of 37 studies reviewed under neighboring earlier (Chapter V). Frequency of chatting with neighbors was coded daily to never on a five-point scale (daily=1, never=5). Fourteen of 37 published studies also used this measure.

The five-point scale used to operationalize frequency of chatting with neighbors was also used to operationalize frequency of spending a social evening with relatives and frequency of spending a social evening with friends. Both measures were used by over half of the studies reviewed in their respective sections earlier (Chapter V).

Independent Variables

Table 6.1 presents all the variables which were discussed in the earlier chapters and which have been associated with more than one area of social contact. The variables are ordered by the model number to which they apply. The variables are identified in the Table by 'n' for a nongeneralizable study, 'r' for a generalizable study, '+' for a positive relationship, '-' for a negative relationship, '_r_' for a generalizable multivariate study, and 'C' for contradictory findings.

Reviewing the variables in Table 6.1, it is possible to distinguish four types of variables according to their appearance in the empirical literature:

1. Those which have only been identified once and have not been replicated, e.g. wife works, empty nesters.
2. Those which have been replicated in some studies but not in others, e.g. marital status, occupation, tenure.
3. Those which have been replicated many times with the same result, e.g. age, education, income.
4. Those which have shown contradictory results from one

Table 6.1 Variables Commonly Associated with Social Contact.[1]

Model	Variables	37	38	41	44	45	46	47	48	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60
		Year Empirical Results' Reported - 19--																		
1	Marital Status										n+[2]		n+				r+	r+		
	Family Life Cycle	n+							n+	n+		r+					r+			
	Family Type/Structure																r+	r+	r+	
	Social Class				r+		n+	n+		n+		r+	n+	r+		r+	$\underline{r}$+		r+	n+
	Empty Nesters																			
2	Residential Mobility													r-			$\underline{r}$+			
	Social Mobility																			
	Occupational Mobility																		r+	
	Values																$\underline{r}$+			
3	Population Size																			
4	Age							n+					n+		r+		r+	r+	r+	n+
	sex			n+		n+	n+			n+	n+		r+			r+	r+	r+	r+	
	Education									n+		r+	r+	r+	r+	r+	r+	r+	r+	
	Occupation					n+				n+		r+	r+	r+	r+	r+	r+	r+	r+	
	Income			n+						n+				r+	r+	r+	$\underline{r}$+	r+	r+	
	Ethnicity													r+		r+	r+	r+	r+	
	Religion											r+					r+	r+		
	Wife Works																			
	Tenure	n+										r+					$\underline{r}$+	r+		
	House Type	n+								r+								r+		
	Length of Residence	n+						n+				r+	n+	r+	r+		r+	r+	r+	
	Own Car											r-								
5	Rural-Urban Location		r+			n+				r-		r+	n+		r+	C	r+	r+	r+	
6	Population Density	n+																		
	Social Homogeneity									r+		r+								

[1] Results referenced in Appendices A to D.

[2] n = non-generalizable, r = generalizable, + = positive relation, - = negative relation, $\underline{r}$ = multivariate generalizable, C = contradictory findings.

Table 6.1 (Continued)

Model	Variables	Year Empirical Results[1] Reported - 19--																		
		61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	74	75	76	77	79	80	81
1	Marital Status				r+			C				r+	r+						r̲+	
	Family Life Cycle		r-		r+			r+			n+		r+	n+		r̲+	n̲+		r̲+	
	Family Type/Structure		n+					r+					r+							
	Social Class	r+	r+	C	r+			r+	r+		n+		C		r+				n+	
	Empty Nesters							r+												
2	Residential Mobility				r+															
	Social Mobility																		n+	
	Occupational Mobility																			
	Values		n+								n+									
3	Population Size									n+										
4	Age				r+			r+				r+	r+	r̲+		r̲+		n+	r̲+	
	sex		r-	r+				C	r+		n+	r+				r̲+			n+	
	Education				r+			r+	n+			r+				r̲+			r̲+	
	Occupation							r+	r+	n+		r+				r̲+				
	Income		n+	r+				r+	n+			r+				r̲+			r̲+	
	Ethnicity		r-	r+				r+	r+			r+		n+		r̲+			n+	
	Religion			r+				r+								r̲+				
	Wife Works													n+		r̲+				
	Tenure																			
	House Type								r+		r+					r̲+				
	Length of Residence							r+	r+					r̲+		r̲+		n+	r̲-	
	Own Car				r+											r̲+				
5	Rural-Urban Location	r-		r-	r+	r+	r+		r+	r+	n+	r+		r̲+		r̲+				r-
6	Population Density																		r̲+	
	Social Homogeneity								n+											

[1] Results referenced in Appendices A to D.

[2] n = non-generalizable, r = generalizable, + = positive relation, - = negative relation, r̲ = multivariate generalizable, C = contradictory findings.

study to the next, e.g. sex, marital status, type of socializing.

Further, Table 6.1 illustrates the tendency of research having been conducted with incomplete reviews of the empirical literature and/or with secondary analyses of existing data. Little or no progression towards data reduction or theory construction is evident. The significance of Table 6.1 is further illustrated by the relatively small number of independent variables which are identified with only one form of social contact. This information is made more explicit in Table 6.2. By far the majority of independent variables have been identified with more than one form of social contact.

The variables tested in the present study are included in Table 6.3. Nearly all of the variables presented in Table 6.1 are found in these data. The variables reviewed earlier and included in the analysis are listed on the left hand side of the Table. The corresponding variable or its proxy from the EAS or LAS is listed or described next, followed by the respective question numbers from each study. The complete survey instruments for both studies are shown in Appendix G.

Referring to Table 6.3, under Model 1, there is insufficient information available to reconstruct family type/structure and social status. Under Model 2, there is no information available in the two studies to construct a measure of residential mobility but length of residence will

Table 6.2 Variables Specific to a Particular Social Contact.[1]

	Variable	Year Empirical Results[1] Reported												
		33	37	47	52	54	55	56	58	62	67	70	76	80
ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP														
Model 2	Reason for Moving			n+										
	Location of Previous Residence				r+									
	Migrant Type						r+							
Model 4	Commuters/Non-commuters							r+						
Other	Classification	n+'												
	Family/Adult Members								r+					
NEIGHBORING														
Model 2	Age of District					r+								
	Propinquity/Proximity				r+									
	Neighborhood Satisfaction											r+		
Model 4	Demographic					r-								
	Commuters/Non-commuters							r+						
	Health										r-			
Model 6	Proportion over 65		n+											
	Tract Income												r+	
	Public Open Space													r+
	Private Open Space													r+
	Density x Private Open Space													r+
Other	Social,					r-								
SOCIALIZING WITH KIN														
Model 4	Health										r-			
Model 6	Closer Relatives (relational)							r+		r+				
SOCIALIZING WITH FRIENDS														
Model 6	Tract Youth												r+	

[1] Results referenced in Appendices A to D.

Table 6.3 Variables to be Tested

Variables Reviewed (Proxy)	EAS	LAS
Model 1		
Age	1	2
Marital Status (Married - Not Married)	2	3
Children (Child - No Child)	2	1/2
Family Life Cycle	2	2
Family Type/Structure		
Empty Nesters	2	2
Occupation	52	67
Social Class	52	67
Social Status		
Model 2		
Income	76	118
Ethnicity (Dummy)	10	9
Tenure	13	19
House Type	I1	I1
Length of Residence	12	11
Residential Mobility (Shelter Cost)	18/22	25/28
Population Density (PCAPTS from Census)		
Town Native		
Age of Neighborhood (NLC from Census)		
Social Mobility		
Occupational Mobility:- (Reason for Moving Here)		13
Attitudes to Community:-		
(Attractive - Un-)	77	119
(Unfriendly - Friendly)	77	119
(Crowded - Uncrowded)	77	119
(Good Place - Poor)	77	119
(Pleasant - Unpleasant)	77	119
(Big City - Rural)	77	119
(Nothing to do - Lots)	77	119
(Hard/get around - Easy)	77	119
(Good place/children-poor)	77	119
(Safe - Unsafe)	77	119
(Poor Climate - Good)	77	119
(Clean air - Dirty air)	77	119
Peoples'/Family Values:-		
(Non-Working Activities)	33	64
(Family Life)	33	64
(Health/Physical Cond.)	33	64
(Activity Time)	33	64
(Friendships)	33	64
(Standard of Living)	33	64
(In General)	33	64
(Job Satisfaction)	58	76
(Residential Satisfaction)	17	24
(Desire to Move)	20	16

Table 6.3 (Continued)

Variables Reviewed	(Proxy)	EAS	LAS
Model 2(continued)			
Neighborhood Satisfaction		24	30
Reason for Moving Here			13
Model 3			
Religion		7	6
	(Religiosity)	8	7
	(Religious Attendance)	9	8
Tract Ethnicity	(British from Census)		
	(German from Census)		
	(Ukranian from Census)		
Model 4			
Sex		2	2
Education		5/6	5
Wife Working		54	71
Own Car			108
Commuters			69/74
Model 5			
Location	(from Census)		
Model 6			
	(Total Persons/Household)	1	1
Tract 65 and over	(PC65 from Census)		
Tract Youth	(PCYOUTH from Census)		
Tract Income	(CTINC from Census)		
Social Homogeneity	(Social Mix from Census)		
Dependent Variables			
Neighboring	(Adults Known)	27	34
	(Chat with Neighbors)	28	35
Socialize with Friends		29	45
Socialize with Kin		30	52
Organizational Membership		65	82

be used as a proxy for at least part of this variable. Shelter cost is included simply because recent increases in the cost of housing suggests the contemporary importance of this variable. Population density is operationalized as Pcapts, the proportion of apartments in the census tract. Age of neighborhood, from Table 6.2, was estimated by census tract for both sets of data and included in the analysis as Nlc. All other Model 2 type variables exist in the studies except proximity of kin and occupational mobility. Some part of the latter will be obtained from the variable Desire to Move. Under Model 3, religiosity and religious attendance have been substituted for religion.

The only direct place variable in the two studies is location under Model 5. In the literature, community size was sometimes used as a proxy for that measure. In the case of these two studies, location is divided into Downtown Edmonton, Suburbs Edmonton, and Smalltown Leduc. In the 1977 EAS, downtown is defined as the area falling approximately with two miles of the main downtown intersection. It is operationalized on the basis of 1976 municipal census tracts. Where the two mile radius bisected a census tract, that tract was included under downtown. The specific census tracts are listed in Table 6.4 in Appendix E.

A question arises, however, about what this variable represents. Some of the models to be tested are based on urban--rural concepts, others are based on urban--suburban concepts. The relationship of Edmonton to Leduc is discussed in the next chapter. But for purposes of this study, it is assumed, following Marshall (1973:143), that the variable location represents places which contain different types of people. The contextual variables under Model 6 are constructed from the latest available census data (1971 Census of Canada).

The only variables in the models which are not available in these data are number of cars, leisure, and commuting. The only variables reviewed in the literature which are not available in the two data sets are location of previous residence, migrant type, proximity of neighbors, and public and private open space.

If Wirth's (1938) prescription is followed, part of the location variable, the rural sample, is missing as well. A rural sample is not available to test with these data. It may be asserted that what was regarded as rural/folk in Wirth's time no longer exists in North America given the influence of large metropolitan areas on the surrounding people. Even people living in remote areas are not immune from the effects of electronic and print media. Simply put, the variation between city and rural area may no longer be as meaningful as it was at one time (Dewey,1960). Variables which represent the qualitative aspects of Wirth's Theory are not available in these data either. This shortcoming, however, does not affect the operationalization of the models.

Methods of Analysis

The research procedure to be used in the analysis which follows calls for the testing of the six models outlined earlier at three different levels of urban scale including downtown, surburb, and small town. The statistical technique most suited to the initial testing of theoretical models where there are multiple determinants of a dependent variable is stepwise multiple regression. It offers two advantages over less robust techniques by permitting:

1. evaluation of the contribution of each model individually and collectively to the final result.
2. assessment of the relative contribution of the models to the dependent variable.
3. identification and comparison of the direct and indirect effects of all variables within and between models (Alwin and Hauser, 1975).

In testing the models, the one that is the best predictor (in terms of r^2 and significance) will be the one that explains the greatest amount of variation in the dependent variable, social contact, in the most parsimonious manner. The test can be completed using either of two procedures. In the first procedure, the variables are entered into a stepwise multiple regression according to the specifications of the models. The variables which are strongest, in terms of beta weights and significance levels, indicate the best model.

The focus of the analysis in the second procedure is on the models, not the individual variables. The variables are entered in the same manner as the first procedure. The best model is selected on the basis of significant increases in cumulative variance. Both of these procedures are used in the present study. The procedures are evaluated at the end of the next section.

Regression Analysis

The ordinal or higher level variables of the Edmonton and Leduc data shown earlier in Table 6.3 were subjected to tests of linearity with each of the dependent variables. It was found that several variables were significantly non-linear with specific dependent variables. Attempts to straighten each distribution included logarithmic and similar transformations and recoding. The specific variables and their transformations are listed in Table 6.4 in Appendix E.

Zero-order correlation matrices of all variables were scanned for correlations greater than .6. Problems of multicollinearity are normally associated with independent variables which correlate at .8 or higher (Nie et al,1975:340-341). Given the large number of independent variables and the relatively imprecise theoretical models to test, it was felt that the more conservative measure of collinearity established at .6 was appropriate.

Two alternative solutions are suggested (Nie et al,1975:340) to remedy multicollinearity. One is to combine the highly correlated pairs of variables into a scale variable which represents both. The second is to run separate regression analyses for each highly correlated set of variables. The latter course was chosen due to the conceptual difficulty which arises when one attempts to combine certain variables such abouttal persons in household with presence or absence of children. Nearly all of the variables constructed from census data were highly correlated. Combining these variables into scales would have destroyed their essential meaning from the theoretical perspective of the models. Each set of highly correlated variables was included in a separate regression analysis and the best variable of each pair, in terms of strength and variance explained, was retained.

Due to the limitation on the total number of variables in the regression packaged program (Nie et al, 1975), initial regressions without stepwise specification using about half of the independent variables at one time were tested against each dependent variable. Variables of each type (personal, physical, etc.) which achieved significance (F = .05) were retained for complete testing of the models. If a particular type of variable failed to be represented under these criteria, a variable with the largest beta weight was selected which fulfilled the specifications of the respective models.

Other problems encountered in the initial regressions were settled according to criteria established by Nie et al

(1975) and Gordon (1968). These problems and the adopted solutions are discussed in Appendix F. The variables used in the final multiple regression equations are listed in Table 6.4 in Appendix E.

The general plan is to test the models at different levels of urban scale. This means that location must be controlled in order to test the models. A problem arises as location is the single independent variable in Model 5 after controlling the variables in Models 1 through 4. It cannot be used as an independent and a control variable at the same time. Thus, Model 5 is tested by itself before the other models are tested across locations.

Before proceeding with the test of Model 5, however, the procedures for selecting the best model have to be evaluated. The initial analysis of the data in this study used the first procedure referred to earlier. It focuses on the strongest significant variables as indicators of the best predicting model. These results are displayed in Tables 6.5 to 6.21 in Appendix E. The tables present the results of testing Models 1 through 4 and Model 6 against five dependent variables using stepwise multiple regression for each location, downtown, suburbs, and smalltown. The results are presented in one summary table for each dependent variable. The major findings for each table are analyzed for three results:

1. The fit of the models.
2. The strongest independent variables through the models.

3. The meaning of the significant variables in the final equation.

Two examples are selected to illustrate the results obtained using this procedure. One example, Organizational Membership, Downtown, in Table 6.5, represents a moderate amount of cumulative variance. The other example, Neighborhood Adults Known in the suburbs, Table 6.9, represents a higher amount of cumulative variance.

In Table 6.5, under Model 1, Social Homogeneity, marital status is significant when entered. It loses significance with the entry of the other models. Three of nine variables are significant when entered under Model 2, Environmental Choice, and remain significant through to the final model. These variables account for most of the variance. Two other Model 2 variables, population density and quality of life satisfaction, became significant with the entry of other models. Two other variables are significant at model entry; education under Model 4, Personal Characteristics, and tract 65 and over under Model 6, Contextual Variables.

Extensive support is thus shown for Michelson's (1979:19,29) Environmental Choice model (Model 2). But variables from other models are significant as well. House type is the strongest variable through the entry of all the models. It is followed by the perception variable, good place for children, and desire to move.

Of even more interest is the way in which variables are affected by the entry of the models. In Model 1, Social Homogeneity, occupation, which is not significant, is negatively correlated with organizational membership. That is, members are more likely to be white collar than blue collar workers. This result is the opposite of what finally achieved significance with the entry of Model 6. None of the variables in Model 3, Urbanism, is significant.

The significant variables in the final equation indicate that membership in organizations downtown is associated with higher educated residents. They live in multiple dwellings in areas where there is lower population density and lower proportions of seniors. They view the city as a good place for children. They tend to be more dissatisfied with their quality of life, and desire to move.

In Table 6.9, at least one variable from each model contributes to the basis of knowing adults in the neighborhood in the suburbs. Marital status from Model 1, Social Homogeneity, is significant. Five of seven variables in Model 2, Environmental Choice, and one variable in each of Models 3, 4, and 6 are significant. The strength of marital status is diminished twice; once with the entry of Model 2 and once with the entry of Model 6. All other significant variables remained significant through to the entry of the final model.

The variables in Model 2, Environmental Choice, account for most of the variance. In that sense, they represent the most important model. Although all models (1, 2, 3, 4, and 6) are supported in Table 6.9, the strongest model is Michelson's (1970:19,29), Environmental Choice. Length of residence is the strongest variable in the equations followed, at some distance, by total persons in household and population density.

The significant variables in the final equation indicate that increases in the number of neighborhood adults known in the suburbs are more likely for higher educated, married, long term residents of Ukranian origin. They are likely live in larger households in an area with lower population density and lower proportions of people of British origin. They find the city attractive and are more satisfied with their quality of life.

It is apparent from the foregoing examples that, irrespective of the strength of the variables, it is not possible to demonstrate which model is the best predictor. Moreover, the strongest significant variables taken together do not provide an adequate substantive explanation of the results. Hence, the procedure that is followed in the following chapters is the second procedure referred to earlier. The best model is selected on the basis of significant increases in cumulative variance as each model is entered into the equation.

Summary

Several methodological concerns have been presented in this chapter. These concerns cover sampling selection and procedures, data collection, variables included, and methods of analysis. Specific problems such as issues of collinearity and the assumptions under which multiple regression may be used were discussed and options selected.

Chapter VII presents a description of the populations, their location, and the effects of location as specified by Model 5, Distance Effects. The testing of the remaining models follows in Chapter VIII. A summary of this study together with conclusions and recommendations is given in Chapter IX.

VII. THE PEOPLE, THEIR LOCATION AND ITS EFFECTS

Introduction

Related to the methodology of this research is the question of the role of location or the place studied. As was demonstrated earlier in the review of the empirical literature, quite often certain findings appear to be specific to a particular place. It has not been established, however, whether this finding is the result of the effect of location or the result of the characteristics of the people in that place. Given the relative importance of both, a more detailed examination of the place of study is called for.

The Locations

Edmonton is a mid-sized (population 471,474, 1977 Municipal Census) city in Western Canada. Originating as a trading post on the North Saskatchewan River, it has developed into the Provincial Legislative capital and regional centre for distribution in northern Alberta and for arctic oil and gas exploration. Its latest growth spurt came as a result of oil and gas discoveries in the north and in particular, the pre-1981 development of oil sands exploration on the Athabaska River.

As noted earlier (Chapter VI), the data are analyzed at three levels including downtown, suburb, and smalltown. Downtown is defined as the inner city portion of Edmonton falling within a two mile radius of the CBD. The area contains older neighborhoods. Some have undergone rehabilitation and others have been almost completely rebuilt into areas of highrise construction. The suburbs fall outside this radius but within the 1977 city limits. Most of this area is dominated by single family dwellings although there is an observable tendency to higher density housing on the periphery.

Leduc is a small town (1977 Municipal Census Population 9,128) located fifteen miles south of Edmonton on the main north-south highway. Originally, a rural service community, it received two significant growth spurts. The first, in 1947, followed the discovery of oil; the second, beginning in 1971, occured with the development of three large subdivisions in the town. Although regarded as a satellite of Edmonton in 1977, the largest single majority (43.8 percent) of Leduc's work force is employed in Edmonton. The balance of its work force is employed locally in light industry, construction, and the international airport close by. Determination of satellite status is a matter of definition. Irrespective of how it is defined, a large proportion of the residents of Leduc maintain connections with Edmonton.

The extent of the relationship of the residents of Leduc to those in Edmonton is further illustrated from a later study of Leduc entitled The Leduc General Plan Study, 1979. In that study, 27 percent of the residents of Leduc had moved there from Edmonton, 40 percent from elsewhere in Alberta, and 16 percent, from elswhere in Canada and outside. Seventeen percent of the residents were raised in Leduc. Among the major reasons why Leduc was chosen as the place of residence was its proximity to the city (8 percent) and proximity to work (11 percent).

Population Characteristics

Selected demographic characteristics represented by mean and median values are detailed in Table 7.1 for Edmonton Downtown, Edmonton Suburb, and Smalltown Leduc. The first four variables in Table 7.1--marital status, family status, total persons in household, and housetype--illustrate the predominance of married couples and families living in single houses in both the suburb and smalltown. Downtown is characterized by a mix of couples and singles living in townhouses or apartments.

To determine more precisely the extent of differences between locations, it is appropriate to test (Mendenhall,1972:111) differences between means of two populations. This test assumes independent samples, an n larger than 30, known sample variances and an assumed normal distribution. There are significant differences (Table 7.1) for all four variables between downtown and the other two locations but not between suburb and smalltown.

The relatively younger ages and relatively short lengths of residence in downtown and smalltown indicate a fairly high degree of residential mobility among younger persons. The significant difference for age is lower (.05) and falls between suburb and smalltown. For length of

Table 7.1 Selected Demographic Characteristics by Location.[1]

		D/T[2]	SUB	S/T
Marital Status	Mean	.53	.81[a]	.80[a]
(0=no spouse, 1=spouse)	Median	.56	.89	.88
Family Status	Mean	.36	.64[a]	.63[a]
(0=no child, 1=child)	Median	.28	.72	.71
Total Persons in Household	Mean	2.45	3.50[a]	3.39[a]
(number)	Median	2.15	3.55	3.45
House Type	Mean	.44	.81[a]	.83[a]
(0=multiple, 1=single)	Median	.40	.89	.90
Age	Mean	38.83	41.93	38.63[d]
(years)	Median	31.00	41.10	32.18
Years in Dwelling	Mean	4.64	8.15[a]	4.46[b]
(number)	Median	2.15	6.00	2.51
Education	Mean	12.21[c]	12.35[c]	11.23
(years)	Median	11.90	12.05	11.63
Income	Mean	10.88[c]	17.71[a]	15.71[d]
($ 000's)	Median	13.50	18.31	17.26
Shelter Costs	Mean	1.82[c]	2.51[a]	3.08[b]
($ 00's)	Median	1.74	2.27	2.96
Tenure	Mean	1.75[c]	1.26[a]	1.14[b]
(1=owns, 2=rents)	Median	1.83	1.17	1.08
Religiosity	Mean	1.93	1.92	1.95
(1=strong, 2=n/v strong, 3=somewhat strong)	Median	1.93	1.93	1.94

[1] Sources: Downtown and Suburbs, 1977 Edmonton Area Study; Smalltown, 1977 Leduc Area Study.

[2] Downtown, Suburb, Smalltown

[a] .01 Significant difference with Downtown.
[b] .01 Significant difference with Suburb.
[c] .01 Significant difference with Smalltown.
[d] .05 Significant difference with Suburb.

residence, the significant difference falls between suburb and downtown and between suburb and smalltown. There is no significant difference between downtown and smalltown.

Education level in Leduc is significantly lower than either place in Edmonton. This reflects a higher proportion of retired persons in the smalltown and a larger proportion of more educated academics and professionals in Edmonton.

The means of the next three variables, income, shelter costs, and tenure, are significantly different between all three locations. The significance level is lower (.05), however, between the suburbs and smalltown. The highest average income prevails in the suburb, closely followed by Leduc. Judging by the median, downtown income appears to be skewed to the left. It reflects the presence of low-income young singles.

The highest shelter costs appear in smalltown Leduc. This is an intriguing finding given that the 1979 Leduc General Plan Study showed 11 percent who liked the town because of the low cost of housing. As Leduc also reveals the highest proportion of home ownership, it is an indication that people in the suburb in 1977 were enjoying the benefit of low-rate fixed mortgages (longer residents). Meanwhile, newcomers to Leduc were having to contend with high rate short term mortgages which, in effect, represented a lower housing cost than that available in the city at that time.

The final variable, a self-report on religiosity, showed no significant differences between means. This is an indication that although there are demonstrable differences on some characteristics, there is no difference on a more global measure.

Summary

In summary, the residents of these three locations are not distinct populations on all demographic characteristics. Significant differences are observed, however, in basic family life cycle and social class variables.

Downtown, the population tends to be younger, mobile, couples and singles, who are renting townhouses or apartments. They have higher levels of education, lower levels of income, and lower shelter costs. This description is very close to that of Gale (1979:295) and Long (1980:66) reviewed earlier (Chapter III). In the suburbs, residents tend to be older, longer resident married persons with families, owning single houses, with higher education, higher income, and higher shelter costs. In the smalltown, residents are generally younger, mobile, married couples with families, owning single houses, with lower education, higher income, and the highest shelter costs. This description contains some of the characteristics associated with small towns by Prior (1968:206-208). The differences with his description may be attributed to ommitted variables. The effects of location specified under Model 5 is tested in the balance of this chapter.

THE EFFECTS OF LOCATION

Introduction

Comparison of the six models discussed earlier (Chapter VI) revealed that Models 1 through 4 and Model 6 may be combined to in order of increasing numbers of variables. The smallest number of independent variables are specified in Model 1 and the largest number in Model 6. Specifications of the relationships between independent and dependent variables in these five models are similar with the exception that Models 4 and 6 were developed specifically to account for urban--suburban rather than urban--rural differences. Social contact or forms of social relationships are based on specified independent variables in each case. Thus it is possible to place these five models (Models 1 through 4 and Model 6) in a single specified stepwise multiple regression on each of the five dependent variables.

As indicated earlier (Chapter VI), the need to control location when testing the models conflicts with the specification of model 5, Distance Effects. Hence, Model 5 will be tested first. The results of testing the other five models will be examined in the Chapter VIII.

The Effects of Location

Model 5, Distance Effects, specifies that informal social interaction in urban-suburban locations increases with distance from the Central Business District (CBD) irrespective of the effects of personal and contextual variables (Fischer and Jackson,1976:279-280). To specifically determine significant differences in social contact between the three locations, an appropriate test (Mendenhall,1972:111) is the difference between means of two populations. Tables 7.2 through 7.6 depict the results by location for each dependent variable.

The data for organizational membership are shown in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2 Locational Differences for Organizational Membership

	Downtown	Suburbs	Leduc
Mean	0.607	0.658	0.541°
Mode	1.0	1.0	1.0
Median	0.676	0.740	0.575
S^2	0.241	0.226	0.249
n =	(122)	(219)	(259)

°.01 significant difference with suburbs.

The lower the number in the Table, the higher the number of persons belonging to no organizations. Organizational membership is highest in the suburbs and lowest in the smalltown. This is the only significant difference in Table 7.2. The finding of no significant differences between downtown and suburb rejects Model 5, Distance Effects, for organizational membership. The data indicating increased nonmembership between downtown and suburb, however, support the direction of the model, supporting Greer (1956:22) and Tallman and Morgner (1970:340). The Leduc result showing the highest proportion of non-membership in organizations may reflect the intrusion of commuting on residents' spare time.

Locational differences in knowing neighborhood adults are depicted in Table 7.3.

Table 7.3 Locational Differences for Neighborhood Adults Known

	Downtown	Suburbs	Leduc
Mean	5.246	4.284°	4.035°
Mode	6.0	5.0	5.0
Median	5.541	4.552	4.183
S^2	1.889	2.527	2.584
n =	(122)	(218)	(259)

°.01 significant difference with downtown.

By inspection of Table 7.3, it is evident that the greater the distance from the CBD, the higher the proportion of adults known. This finding supports Tallman and Morgner (1970:339) among others. The difference between means test reveals that the differences between downtown and suburb, and downtown and smalltown are significant. The difference between suburb and smalltown is not significant. Model 5, Distance Effects, because it is specified under urban-suburban location, is therefore supported with these data. The median results for the suburban group indicates a skewed distribution, however, this may mean a tendency towards reduced contact with neighbors as suburbs age.

Similar results do not occur with the other measure of neighboring in Table 7.4.

Table 7.4 Locational Differences for Chat with Neighbors

	Downtown	Suburbs	Leduc
Mean	3.256°	3.220°	2.741
Mode	4.0	4.0	2.0
Median	3.515	3.280	2.527
S^2	1.909	1.306	1.596
n =	(121)	(218)	(259)

°.01 significant difference with Leduc.

Inspection shows that frequency of chatting with neighbors increases with distance from the CBD. This difference is significant between small town and the other two. It is not significant between downtown and suburb. This finding is intriguing given the weight of earlier findings (Tomeh,1964:34;Key, 1965:383-384) which support Model 5, Distance Effects. In fact, it may simply be the result of decreasing interaction in aging suburbs. The smalltown demonstrates chatting levels formerly associated with suburbs (Logan and Semyonov,1980:96). It is also possible that higher rates of chatting are occurring downtown due to the comparatively recent return migration of young marrieds and singles (Long,1980:66).

Table 7.5 Locational Differences
for Social Evening with Relatives

	Downtown	Suburbs	Leduc
Mean	3.156	3.222	3.133
Mode	3.0	3.0	3.0
Median	3.056	3.122	3.057
S^2	1.356	1.188	0.903
n =	(122)	(216)	(255)

No significant differences between means were found for either the frequency of social evenings spent with relatives or with friends. In Table 7.5, the higher the number (mean), the lower the frequency of socializing with relatives. As the lowest frequency occurs in the suburbs, the Distance Effects model is not supported. In fact, the downtown-suburb direction of relationships is reversed. Lack of support for locational differences were also reported by Garigue (1956:1098) and Key (1961:54). But others researching urban-suburban locations (Greer,1956:22;Tomeh,1964:34; Winch and Greer,1968:45), support the model. The present result could also occur due to aging suburbs and two migration streams, one to downtown, the other to smalltown. But that may only be determined by obtaining the location of previous residence from current residents.

Table 7.6 Locational Differences for Social Evening with Friends

	Downtown	Suburbs	Leduc
Mean	2.738	2.812	2.886
Mode	2.0	3.0	3.0
Median	2.528	2.781	2.790
S^2	0.840	0.623	0.797
n =	(122)	(218)	(254)

Although no significant differences were observed in Table 7.6, the relationship between location and social evening with friends is actually reversed from what was predicted by the model. Frequency of socializing with friends decreases with distance from the CBD but the differences between means are not significant. This finding runs counter to evidence reported earlier by Greer (1956:22) and Tomeh (1964:34). This later finding may reflect more recent patterns of migration. It may also result from reduced social contact with friends in aging suburbs. Determination of these alternatives is not possible with these data.

The results thus far show that only one variable, knowing neighborhood adults, acts as predicted by the Distance Effects model. But the difference between the result for suburbs and that for smalltown is not significant. It may be argued that suburbs are no different from small towns. However, the population characteristics discussed earlier demonstrated that there were significant differences between the people in those locations. It has not yet been established whether or not differences between locations reflect real differences attributable to the location exclusively or whether they reflect demographic differences within areas (Marshall,1973).

The ultimate test of Model 5 is a multiple regression analysis which allows us to control the possible interactive effects of personal and contextual variables (Marshall,1973) on distance. In order to test Model 5, and ensure equal treatments across all locations, the same set of independent variables is used in stepwise multiple regression. Personal, physical, housing, contextual and location variables were entered in that order. These are regressed on all five dependent variables. The results of this operation are summarized in the first part of Table 7.7.

In three instances--knowing neighborhood adults, chatting with neighbors, and socializing with relatives--the addition of location, after controlling all other variables, was significant (F = .00). The increase in explained variance with the addition of location was not large (less than .04) and hardly large enough to justify location as a pivotal variable.

The direction of the relationship between distance and social contact was as predicted by Model 5 except for organizational membership. Surprisingly, the direction with organizational membership was opposite to that predicted by the model but it was not significant. Membership in organizations was inversely related to distance from the CBD. Given the importance attributed to location in the literature on social contact, the amount of variance it accounts for when included in a regression equation does not support its use as a distinguishing variable. It may be that the people, individually or collectively, at a particular location are responsible levels of social contact, not the location itself.

Table 7.7 Comparison of Cumulative Variance by Location on Selected Dependent Variables

	Dependent Variables				
	N'borhood Adults Known	Chat with Neighbors	Socialize with Friends	Socialize with Relatives	Organizational Member
Cumulative r^2 before location added	.28	.08	.12	.04	.10
Total r^2 after location added	.32[1] (542)[2]	.10[1] (541)	.12 (537)	.04[1] (543)	.10 (536)
	With Location controlled				
Total r^2 - Downtown	.25 (109)	.14 (109)	.25 (109)	.17 (109)	.18 (108)
- Suburb	.45 (190)	.24 (191)	.14 (189)	.11 (190)	.17 (189)
- Smalltown	.26 (243)	.10 (241)	.19 (239)	.06 (243)	.09 (239)

[1] r^2 difference significant at .00

[2] Sample size (542)

FINE PRINT

Accordingly, location will be removed from the regression equations here and we will use it as a control variable to divide the data into three sub-sets, downtown, suburb, and smalltown. This follows the recommendations of Michelson (1970) and Marshall (1973). The results are shown in the second part of Table 7.7. With few exceptions, explained variance is increased for all dependent variables, but not in the manner predicted by Model 5.

If Model 5, Distance Effects, were true, that is, if informal social contact increases with distance from the CBD after controlling for the effects of personal and contextual variables (Fischer and Jackson,1976:279-280), controlling location should remove its effect. The same independent variables should explain similar amounts of variance regardless of location. Both neighboring variables, neighborhood adults known and chatting with neighbors, increase in the suburbs. Socializing with friends increases downtown. Socializing with relatives and organizational membership decrease with distance from the CBD.

Conclusion

The conclusion to be drawn from the above analysis has to be predicated on the robustness of the statistical technique. The findings reviewed earlier (Chapter V) and the initial methods used in this chapter were largely correlational. A relationship between distance and social contact was demonstrated in isolation without considering the effects of other variables. When these other variables are included and controlled, as in the multiple regression, the results quite clearly demonstrate that whatever difference there may be in social contact between locations, it is unwise to attribute that difference solely to location. The differences in results between each type of social contact, even between two measures of neighboring, confirm that each form of social contact, as noted by Rosow (1967:219), is unique.

Used as a variable in the regression equations, location produced limited results. When it is used as a control, the results of social contact are increased. Levels of social contact are the result of social interaction. So, the importance of location is not its physical space alone but as a focal point for social interaction.

Nevertheless, location did enhance the final results. This control will be used in Chapter VIII to test the five remaining models against the five dependent variables.

VIII. THE DETERMINANTS OF SOCIAL CONTACT

Introduction

It was demonstrated in the previous chapter that distance from CBD (location) did not predict levels of various types of social contact (Model 5). This was made possible by using a higher statistical procedure which controlled the effects of each variable in turn. This finding also presents a commentary on the conclusions to be drawn from the earlier review (Chapter V) of the empirical literature. As most of the data in that literature was analyzed using less robust and complex statistical techniques, the conclusions to be drawn therefrom must be held in abeyance until the appropriate test can be made.

In this chapter, these tests will be applied to models 1 through 4 and Model 6 against different measures of social contact. Five measures are used in all: one for organizational membership, two for neighboring, and one each for socializing with kin and socializing with friends.

Using stepwise multiple regression, the summary results are presented in one table for each dependent variable in Tables 8.1 to 8.4. The calculation of significant differences between variances followed the recommended procedure of Nie et al (1975:339).

The results of testing the models are analyzed by dependent variable for three results:

1. The significant model. Where more than one model is

significant, the model which explains the most variation in social contact is the one selected. The models are arranged in order of increasing numbers of variables from the lowest to the highest model number. The determination of the most significant model is based on the strength of the variables in the model, not the number. However, the statistical significance of a model may be affected by the number of redundant variables it contains.

2. Comparison with empirical literature. The highest significant model is compared with the appropriate empirical research reviewed earlier in Chapter V.
3. Comparison with other multivariate analyses. Where appropriate, the results are also compared with the multivariate analyses reviewed earlier (Chapter V).

Analyses by each location for each type of social contact is discussed and summarized below.

It should be noted that the cumulative variances displayed in the following Tables 8.1 through 8.4 are greater than the total variances displayed earlier in Table 7.7 (Chapter VII). In testing the models in Tables 8.1 to 8.4, the strongest, most significant independent variables of each type specified by the models were selected to produce the maximum possible variance. As the strongest independent variables varied in each case by dependent variable and location, the variables selected showed some differences between each regression. In testing Model 5 in

Table 7.7, however, the independent variables specified in the Model were controlled and not changed between locations in order to show the net effect of location.

Organizational Membership

Table 8.1 shows the results of testing Models 1 to 4 and Model 6 on organizational membership. Each row displays cumulative variances (r^2) coinciding with the entry of each model. It is obvious from Table 8.1 that one model alone does not account for the determinants of organizational membership at all locations. There is no significant model for explaining social contact downtown. In the suburbs, Model 4, Personal Characteristics, is the finally significant model. In the smalltown, Model 6, Contextual Variables, is finally significant. Notably, in both the suburbs and the smalltown, four models achieve significance with variation between Models 4 and 6.

Table 8.1 Increases in Cumulative Variance for Selected Models on Organization Membership by Location.

	Model Nos.				
	1	2	3	4	6
Downtown	.05	.18	.18	.21	.24
Suburb	.05[1]	.14[0]	.16[1]	.21[0]	.23
Smalltown	.07[0]	.12[1]	.14[1]	.16	.19[1]

[0] Significant at .00

[1] Significant at .05

Downtown. Significance tests of differences between cumulative r^2 show no significant model for downtown. The F ratio for Model 2, Environmental Choice, was short by only .07, which, although not significant, makes Model 2 the strongest model at that location. Model 2, Environmental Choice (Michelson,1970:62-63) holds that people are governed by their life style based on income, ethnicity, and life cycle stages. It builds on Model 1 by adding variables associated with the physical environment (19), values (24), and perceptions (29).

This finding supports the earlier results of Freeman et al's (1957) multivariate analysis of Spokane, Washington, data. Freeman et al (1957:531) explained a larger amount of variance (.26) than the present data. However, their final equation contained a number of attitudes toward the community variables. The inclusion of variables of a similar type may have inflated their results through collinearity of unequal numbers of independent variables in sets (Gordon,1968).

Suburbs. A number of models achieved significance in the suburbs. The strongest was Model 4. Model 4, Personal Characteristics, posits that levels of social contact between urban and suburban residents vary by personal characteristics (Marshall,1973:127-133; Fischer and Jackson,1976:279,291,299). The present finding supports the findings of numerous other empirical studies reviewed earlier (e.g. Larson,1938; Sinclair and Westhues,1974), all of which supported Model 4 across a wide range of locations and methodologies.

Support for Model 4 comes from multivariate analysis reported by Kasarda and Janowitz (1974). Using a national sample of England, they found (330) strong evidence in support of what they called a systemic model. This focused on length of residence as the key variable in locally-based social interaction. They found (334) length of residence, positively aligned, was the largest single predictor (standardized beta = .310) of organizational membership. The importance of age and large urban location followed closely. Their results are not fully comparable to this study as variances were not reported. However, their standardized beta is roughly double the findings here. One explanation for this difference may be that their result reflects social contact differences which are national in origin.

Smalltown. Several models are significant in smalltown. The most complex is Model 6, Contextual Variables. In the original discussion of this model, Fischer and Jackson (1976:279) argued that differences in social contact are attributable to population composition in a given location. As noted earlier (Chapter IV), this model may be called a social deterministic model in that social behaviour is caused by the social character of a place. Or it may be that the social characteristics perceived by newcomers cause them to socialize in certain ways.

Our results indirectly support those of Bell and Boat (1957) and Greer and Kube (1959). The variables used include family type and economic indicators of social types of neighborhoods (Bell and Boat,1957: 392), and three aggregate neighborhood indices of urbanism, fertility, single family dwelling units, and women working (Greer and Kube,1959:95-97). No studies of organizational membership which used multivariate analysis of Model 6 type variables were found.

Overall, the best multivariate determinant of organizational membership is a different model in each location. All three models provide about the same amount of explained variance (.18 to .21). Thus it may be tentatively concluded (subject to replication) that each model provides a unique solution in ascertaining the determinants of organizational membership in the population at each location.

It is indicated in the above findings that the younger people living downtown who are mobile, who earn high incomes and who rent multiple dwellings largely determine their organizational membership through personal choices influenced by physical variables, values, and perceptions. The residents of the suburbs, who are older married couples with children living in owned single family dwellings join organizations according to personal characteristics (such as the extent of commuting). Most of the residents in the smalltown are younger married couples who are more recent arrivals and who own single family dwellings. Those who belong to organizations are affected by the context in which they live. In particular, the social characteristics of the place, whether or not they are conscious of them.

Neighboring

The two dependent measures of neighboring used in this analysis are shown in Table 8.2. The results from the measure of knowing neighborhood adults are shown in the first part of Table 8.2; chatting with neighbors in the second part of the same table.

Table 8.2 Increases in Cumulative Variance for Selected Models on Neighboring by Location.

Neighborhood Adults Known
Model Nos.

	1	2	3	4	6
Downtown	.04	.21^{0}	.22	.24	.26
Suburb	.07^{0}	.43^{0}	.44	.45	.48^{1}
Smalltown	.03	.27^{0}	.28	.30	.34^{0}

Chat with Neighbors

	1	2	3	4	6
Downtown	.04	.13	.16	.18	.22
Suburb	.12^{0}	.19^{0}	.26^{0}	.28	.32^{0}
Smalltown	.02	.10^{0}	.12	.13	.14

^{0}Significant at .00

^{1}Significant at .05

In Table 8.2, Model 2 is significant for both types of neighboring for all locations, except for downtown, chatting with neighbors. Downtown, no model presents significant results, but the strongest model is Model 2. Model 6 is the finally significant model for both types of neighboring in the suburb and for neighborhood adults known in smalltown.

Model 2, Environmental Choice (Table 8.2), is the best model for explaining neighboring downtown and chatting with neighbors in smalltown. It states that social contact varies according to variables associated with the physical environment, values, and perceptions (Michelson,1970). This result provides support for the findings of three studies, Caplow and Forman (1950), Lansing et al (1970), and Thorns (1975). Both Caplow and Forman (1950) and Lansing et al (1970)found that neighboring, variously measured, varied by house type. But Thorns' (1975) study in London, England, found no variation in neighboring by how a subdivison was planned.

Model 6, Contextual Variables (Table 8.2), is the best model for neighboring in the suburb and for neighborhood adults known in smalltown. It states that social contact varies by the social character of a place (Marshall,1973; Fischer and Jackson,1976).

The above result supports the findings of several other studies (e.g. Bernard,1937; Bell and Boat,1957; Fischer,1981) in several different locations over a number of years. Among these studies are two which used multivariate analysis; Fischer and Jackson (1976) and Fox et al (1980).

Fischer and Jackson (1976:298-299) from an analysis of the Detroit Area Study, found that tract income was the best predictor of their neighboring scale. Using a set of variables which are similar to the present analysis, they accounted for .075 of the variance. This study accounts for .48 and .32 of the variance respectively for neighborhood adults known and chatting with neighbors. This remarkable distinction is difficult to account for. It may be a result of controlling location in the present study.

Fox et al (1980:356) reanalyzed a 1972 national United States sample and found that the proportion of private open space close by was the strongest independent variable in their multivariate analysis. Tract income was not included in their data. Their explained variance, up to .36, was closer to the present finding.

In suburbs, in addition, both measures of neighboring supported Models 1, 2, and 6. Model 3 is also significant in chatting with neighbors.

Overall, two models, 2 and 6, are the best determinants of neighboring. These contain some interesting variations between locations and type of neighboring in the amounts of variance explained. Similar to the previous finding with organizational membership, Model 2 is the best model common to all locations for both types of neighboring. Model 2 has less explanatory power (variance) than Model 6 in any location for neighboring. Under organizational membership, however, Model 2, although not significant downtown, explained almost as much variance as Models 4 or 6.

The variance explained by Model 6 in this result encompasses that explained by Fox et al (1980). It may be concluded, therefore, that Model 6 is somewhat supported at that level (.32 to .48). As Model 2 explains much less variance when it is the strongest model under neighboring, it may be concluded that the specifications of the models may not yet be complete. This is especially true when the other models at those locations failed to achieve significance.

Overall, based on the significant models at each location or the differences in the total amounts of significant variances, it may be tentatively concluded that each finding provides a unique solution to ascertaining the determinants of neighboring. The significant models do not discriminate in terms of type of model and variance explained (which is quite low in two instances) as they did under organizational membership.

These findings indicate that the younger mobile population downtown have a similar basis for determining neighboring and organizational membership. For the majority, neighboring of either form is determined largely by personal choices enhanced by physical variables, values and perceptions. The older, married resident living longer in the suburbs has a different orientation toward neighboring of both types than towards organizational membership. Neighboring is determined by the context in which it takes place. The social character of the area is the biggest influence.

Most of the younger marrieds in smalltown have the same orientation towards neighborhood adults as the suburban residents. This is determined largely by the social character of the place. For chatting with neighbors in smalltown, the major determinant is personal choice influenced by physical variables, values and perceptions. Model 2, Environmental Choice, is common to all locations for both types of neighboring and organizational membership.

Taken together, there is some similarity in the results for both types of neighboring downtown and suburbs. But the findings are still unique to each place for each type of neighboring. In sum, the results altogether still discriminate the populations and types of neighboring but the significant models are not as strong on some occasions.

It should also be noted that two types of social contact, organizational membership and neighboring, normally take place outside the home whereas the other two types of social contact, social evening with relatives and social evening with friends, normally take place in the home. Model 2 is the best common model for organizational membership and neighboring.

Social Evening with Relatives

The results of testing the models on social evening with relatives is shown in Table 8.3. In Table 8.3, no one model provides the determinants of social evening with relatives for all locations. Model 4 is significant downtown, models 2 and 3 in the suburb, and no model is significant in smalltown. The latter is the only case in the entire analysis where the best model cannot be determined. In terms of F ratio, several models are close to 25 percent short of achieving significance.

Table 8.3 Increases in Cumulative Variance for Selected Models on Social Evening with Relatives by Location.

	Model Nos.				
	1	2	3	4	6
Downtown	.01	.09	.11	.20[0]	.23
Suburb	.03	.11[1]	.15[1]	.16	.17
Smalltown	.01	.04	.05	.07	.07

[0] Significant at .00

[1] Significant at .05

Downtown. Model 4 was the only significant model downtown and explained .20 of the variation in social evening with relatives. Model 4, Personal Characteristics, posits that levels of social contact between urban and suburban residents vary by personal characteristics (Marshall,1973:127-133; Fischer and Jackson,1976:279,291, 299)

This finding supports the findings of the majority of studies reviewed earlier in Chapter V (e.g. Axelrod,1956;

Adams,1968; Lee,1980). Among these studies were two which used multivariate analysis of data: Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) and Mogey (1977). Since the latter used factor analysis, the results obtained by Mogey are not strictly comparable.

Kasarda and Janowitz found (1974), from a national sample of England, that socializing with kin was related to rural-urban location, age, and length of residence, in that order. The amount of variance explained by their equations was not reported.

Suburb. The significant model in suburb was Model 3. Model 3, Urbanism, was prescribed by Fischer (1975) who argued that social contact increases with the presence of subcultures in larger population concentrations.

The present finding is unique as the one study of social contact which uses subcultural variables in its analysis (Fischer and Jackson,1976:291) failed to show significant results.

Smalltown. The lack of significant or best model for social evening with relatives in smalltown is not explained by the data. The total variance achieved in the equation after the addition of Model 6 was only .07. There is no apparent discrepancy between variables or directions of relationships. One possible conclusion has to be that the crucial variables to social evening with kin in smalltown have not been included.

Overall, the best determinant of a social evening with relatives for downtown and suburb is a different model. No model achieved significance for smalltown. The amount of variance explained (r^2) is highest downtown, lower in the suburbs, and minimal in smalltown. It should be noted that the amount of explained variance is substantially reduced compared to results on other types of social contact (e.g. suburbs, neighborhood adults known).

Where results achieved significance, the models still provide a unique solution to locating the determinants of socializing with kin in downtown and suburb. In addition, the significant models are unique to the population at that location as well as the type of social contact.

These results show that the younger mobile population downtown has a different basis for spending a social evening with relatives than either neighboring or organizational membership. The determinant of spending a social evening with relatives for most of this population is personal characteristics. The result for the suburb is a unique finding. The determinant of spending a social evening with relatives for the longer resident married couples with children in the suburbs is the presence of religious, ethnic, or occupational subcultures.

Social Evening with Friends

The results of testing the models on spending a social evening with friends are shown in Table 8.4. In Table 8.4, no one model provides the determinants of social evening with friends for all locations. Model 3, Urbanism, is significant downtown, Model 1, Social Homogeneity, in the suburbs, and Model 6, Contextual Variables, in smalltown. Of the lower numbered significant models, Model 1, Social Homogeneity, is common to all three locations, Model 3, Urbanism, is common to downtown and smalltown.

Table 8.4 Increases in Cumulative Variance for Selected Models on Social Evening with Friends by Location.

	Model Nos.				
	1	2	3	4	6
Downtown	.18[0]	.25	.30[1]	.32	.33
Suburb	.07[0]	.10	.13	.14	.17
Smalltown	.10[0]	.14	.18[0]	.21	.24[1]

[0] Significant at .00

[1] Significant at .05

Downtown. Turning to Table 8.4, the best determinant is Model 3, Urbanism. Fischer (1975) argued that urbanism, based on population size, affects social life in the city by creating and strengthening subcultures defined by ethnicity, religion, or occupation.

The only empirical support for Model 3 is provided by Guterman (1969). He found (495) that intimacy of friendship ties varied inversely with population size.

Suburb. Model 1 achieved significance in the suburb accounting for .07 of the variation in social evening with friends. Model 1, Social Homogeneity, is based on Gans' (1968:45) conclusions resulting from a study of inner city social contact and Marshall's (1973:126) delineation of it as one of three ways to distinguish life style between city and suburb.

The present result supports the earlier finding of Gordon and Noll's (1975) secondary analysis of the 1963 NORC study of United States metropolitan areas. They found (243) that both contact with friends and number of friends positively correlate with social class based on education, occupation, and income. The only other study which tested friendship and family life cycle (Wayne,1972:90) found that friendship participation decreases with stage in the family life cycle in East York.

Smalltown. Model 6, Contextual Variables, is the best predictor (.24) of spending a social evening with friends in smalltown. Model 6 (Fischer and Jackson,1976:279) states that social contact varies with the social character of a place.

The present result supports previous positive findings. Bell and Boat (1957) found a positive relationship between family type and social class indicators of social types of neighborhood using aggregate data. But two other studies (Greer and Kube,1959;Wayne,1972) found no relationships. Greer and Kube (1959) found no relationship between social evening with friends and aggregate measures of fertility ratio, single family dwellings, and wives working. Wayne (1972) found no relationships for neighborhood class and familism contextual measures with socializing with friends.

Findings here also support one of two (Fischer and Jackson,1976; Fischer,1981) multivariate studies of the determinants of socializing with friends. Fischer and Jackson (1976:298) found that the proportion of youth in the census tract was positively related to the proportion of friends in the neighborhood. But Fischer (1981:315) concluded that urbanism based on proximity to concentrations of people (construed here to represent contextual population density) is not related to friendship.

Hence, Model 6 is supported by the most powerful statistical analysis but there still remains a possibility that the relationship of Model 6 depends on how the contextual variable is specified.

In summary, Model 1, Social Homogeneity, is significant and common to social evening with friends but there is a considerable difference in the variance explained between downtown, smalltown, and suburb.

The results for socializing with friends are unique in that a different model accounts for the most significant variance for the population at each location in a way that is different again to the results under other types of social contact. Again, no discernable relationship exists between the population at each location and the best model.

The models provide a unique solution for each type of social contact.

The above results indicate that the basis of spending a social evening with friends is different for each population. For the younger, mobile, couples and singles downtown, spending a social evening with friends is mostly determined by the presence of subcultures. For the older, longer resident marrieds with children in the suburb, it is mostly determined by social homogeneity based on social class and stage in family life cycle. In the small town, for most of the younger marrieds, spending a social evening with friends is determined largely by the social context of the place.

Summary of Results by Type of Social Contact

Organizational Membership.

A unique solution was obtained for the population at each location. The determinants of organizational membership were most significantly explained by Model 2, Environmental Choice, downtown; Model 4, Personal Characteristics,in the suburbs; and Model 6, Contextual Variables, for smalltown. The proportion of explanation in terms of variance was fairly constant across locations.

Neighboring.

For neighborhood adults known and chatting with neighbors, the significant models did not provide a unique solution for the population at each location. For neighborhood adults known, Model 2, Environmental Choice, was unique downtown, but Model 6, Contextual Variables, was the best model for both suburb and smalltown. The proportion of variance explained by Model 6 was also substantially higher than Model 2 downtown.

In chatting with neighbors, Model 2 is common to downtown and smalltown with relatively small amounts of variance explained. Model 6 was unique to the suburb and accounted for nearly three times the variance at each of the other locations.

When the results for each type of neighboring are compared at each location without focusing only on the most significant model, they are unique in terms of the significant models or the amount of variance explained at each location. The significant model downtown is Model 2, Environmental Choice. The significant models in the suburbs are Models 1, Social Homogeneity, 2, Environmental Choice, and 6, Contextual Variables. Models 2 and 6 are significant for smalltown. For chatting with neighbors, Model 2 is not significant downtown but accounts for more variance than the significant Model 2 in smalltown. Models 1, 2, 3, Urbanism, and 6 are significant in the suburbs. Model 6 alone is significant for smalltown.

Socializing with Kin.

A unique solution in ascertaining the determinants of socializing with kin was obtained for downtown and suburb. Model 4, Personal Characteristics, was significant downtown and models 2, Environmental Choice, and 3, Urbanism, in the suburbs. But no solution was obtained for smalltown. In addition, the amounts of variance explained decreased from downtown (.20) through suburb (.15) to smalltown (.07). Inspection of the results failed to provide any indication about why this is so.

Socializing with Friends.

For socializing with friends the most significant models unique to each location are Model 3, Urbanism, downtown, Model 1, Social Homogeneity, suburb, and Model 6, Contextual Variables, smalltown. The amounts of variance explained downtown (.30) and smalltown (.22) is in line with other findings here. The result for model 1 in suburb (.07) is an identical amount to that obtained under socializing with kin in smalltown where no significant result was obtained.

Thus, unique models are the best determinants of three types of social contact--organizational membership, socializing with kin, and socializing with friends--across locations with the exception of socializing with kin in smalltown where no result was obtained. The best models under both types of neighboring were not unique but the overall result at each location was.

Summary of Results Collectively

As noted earlier, both organizational membership and neighboring are unique among the four types of social contact as they generally occur outside the home. In all three cases, organizational membership, neighborhood adults known, and chatting with neighbors, Model 2, Environmental Choice, was the best model downtown, Models 4, Personal Characteristics, and 6, Contextual Variables, are the best in suburb, and models 2 and 6 in smalltown.

Although the results for these two types of social contact are unique by location, collectively, there is some commonality by location among the models for social contact which takes place predominantly outside the home.

It is indicated by these results that for the younger, mobile, higher earning, couples and singles renting townhouses or apartments downtown, their outside social contact is determined largely through personal choices influenced by physical variables, values, and perceptions. This indication applies to organizational membership as well as both types of neighboring.

In the suburbs, for the majority of the longer resident, older, married, homeowners with children, both types of neighboring are mostly determined by the social context or social character of the area. Organizational membership for the suburban population, however, is more a function of personal characteristics associated with daily living.

The younger, married, recently arrived homeowners in smalltown display a different pattern from Edmonton residents altogether. Organizational membership and neighborhood adults known is largely determined by the social context of the area. Chatting with neighbors is more a function of personal choices influenced by physical variables, values and perceptions. This commonality does not extend to the other two types of social contact, however. Unique results are obtained for socializing with kin and socializing with friends.

In the final chapter which follows, conclusions will be drawn from a brief review of this study. Recommendations for future research are derived therefrom.

IX. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study focused on ascertaining the determinants of social contact in urban, suburban, and small town settings. The major theorist in this area of research was identified as Wirth. His "Theory of Urbanism" (1938) is predicated on the effects and interaction of population size, density, and heterogeneity of people living in cities. His behavioral postulates were extensively analyzed. Three forms of social contact and their postulated consequences were identified.

Criteria for the proper testing of Wirth's (1938) postulates were introduced and discussed. It was concluded that Wirth can only be tested under two conditions (Guterman, 1969):

1. When empirical measures reflect the true dimensions implicit in Wirth's discussion.
2. When data are derived from a range of population sizes and densities from cities, small towns, and rural areas.

Empirical tests of the behavioral postulates of Wirth's (1938) theory were examined. Three studies were identified which specifically cited Wirth, directly tested his behavioral postulates, and met the above conditions, Key (1961), Key (1965), and Guterman (1969). The results were equivocal. Key's (1961) study of kin relations failed to support Wirth (1938). However, Key's (1965) study of neighboring did support Wirth. Guterman's (1969) study of friendship also supported Wirth, but Wirth did not directly mention friendship in his theory.

Other studies were reviewed which specifically cited Wirth (1938) but did not meet Guterman's (1969) two conditions. In addition to size, density, and heterogeneity, these studies identified nineteen other variables with forms of social contact. Their results are inconclusive, however, due to methodological problems with data collection. As a result, it was concluded that while Wirth's (1938) behavioral postulates had not been adequately tested, focusing on three variables alone is less productive in terms of scope and explanation than searching for the correlates of social contact as a whole. Other empirical research was reviewed which addressed related issues such as population turnaround and occupational mobility but it was also found to be inconclusive.

The narrow focus of Wirth's (1938) theory and the inconclusive empirical evidence ultimately led to the determination of six theoretical models which provide a wider focus to search for determinants of social contact. These are identified as follows:

1. Social Homogeneity. Social contact increases with social class and stage in family life cycle (Gans,1968; Marshall,1973).
2. Environmental Choice. Social contact varies by physical environment, values, and perceptions (Michelson,1970).
3. Urbanism. Social contact increases with presence of

subcultures in larger population concentrations (Fischer,1975).

4. Personal Characteristics. Social contact varies by personal characteristics (Marshall,1973;Fischer and Jackson,1976).
5. Distance Effects. Social contact increases with distance from Central Business District (Marshall,1973;Fischer and Jackson,1976).
6. Contextual Variables. Social contact varies by the social character of a place (Marshall,1973;Fischer and Jackson,1976).

In order to operationalize the concepts in the six models, the models were used as a screening device to review empirical research on four types of social contact; organizational membership, neighboring, socializing with relatives, and socializing with friends. The empirical literature was reviewed by type of social contact and by model as well.

Some empirical support was found for all of the models except Model 3, Urbanism, across all four types of social contact. It was not possible to draw conclusions about the best model in terms of explanation or in terms of their relative merits without the benefit of testing all of the models simultaneously in a multivariate analysis. Simply on the basis of numbers of studies, Model 4, Personal Characteristics, was overwhelmingly supported in all four types of social contact. This appears to be the result of individual speculation about the nature of social contact rather than an effort to distil and simplify results.

Problems associated with analyzing existing data were discussed in Chapter VI. The majority of the variables in these data were operationalized in a fashion which is similar to other published studies. The five variables which are not available in the data were not specified in the models. The main limitation in testing the models in these data is the lack of a rural sample. Although the differences between city and country may no longer be meaningful (Dewey,1960), this limitation should not be set aside until conclusive evidence is produced.

The need to test the models at different levels of urban scale--downtown, suburbs, and smalltown--conflicted with the specification of Model 5, Distance Effects. Location had to be controlled to test the models but location is also the single independent variable in Model 5. Model 5 had to be tested before the other models in order to discover if location produced a difference in results in levels of social contact.

A preliminary analysis of the populations of Edmonton and Leduc showed a number of significant differences. These were based on family life cycle and social class variables between the downtown, suburbs, and smalltown. But the populations are not significantly different on other measures.

The population downtown mostly consists of younger, mobile, couples or singles, who are renting townhouses or apartments. They have higher levels of education, lower levels of income, and lower shelter costs. Residents in the suburbs are generally older, longer resident married couples, with families, who own single houses. The majority show higher levels of education, higher income, and higher shelter costs. In the smalltown, residents tend to be mostly younger mobile married couples with families. Most of them own single houses, have lower education levels, higher income, and the highest shelter costs.

In testing Model 5, Distance Effects, it was demonstrated that conclusions about empirical findings may differ as a result of the particular statistical technique selected. Using a difference of means test, a relationship was documented between location and social contact without considering the effects of other variables. When all of the variables were included in a stronger statistical test, multiple regression, the relationship between location and social contact is insufficient to justify its prominence in the literature. Controlling location enhanced the final result. This confirmed that each form of social contact is unique (Rosow,1967:219). The meaning of location does not appear to be related to physical space. Rather, it is best conceived as a focal point of interaction for different types of people.

When the other models were tested using multiple regression analysis, different findings were unique to each type of social contact. At the same time, a limited amount of commonality among the models was observed with organizational membership and neighboring. Interestingly, both types of social contact are largely maintained outside the home.

The results are summarized in Table 9.1. In Table 9.1, under organizational membership, Model 2, Environmental Choice, was the best model downtown, Model 4, Personal Characteristics, in the suburbs, and Model 6, Contextual Variables, in smalltown. Model 2, Environmental Choice, or Model 6, Contextual Variables, was the best model for both types of neighboring; Model 2, downtown, Model 6 in the suburb, Model 6 for neighborhood adults known and Model 2 for chatting with neighbors in smalltown. The total result still provided a unique finding for each type of neighboring at each location. Model 2, Environmental Choice, was also common to all locations for both of these forms of social contact.

The best determinant of spending a social evening with relatives was a different model downtown and in the suburbs. Model 4, Personal Characteristics, was significant downtown and Model 3, Urbanism, in the suburbs. No model achieved significance in smalltown. This is the only null result in the entire study.

Table 9.1 Significant Models and Cumulative Variance for Selected Types of Social Contact by Location

	Dependent Variables									
	Organizational Member		N'borhood Adults Known		Chat with Neighbors		Socialize with Relatives		Socialize with Friends	
	Model	r^2	Model	r^2	Model	r^2	Model	r^2	Model	r^2
Downtown	2	.18	2°	.21	2	.13	4°	.20	1°	.18
									3'	.30
Suburbs	1'	.05	1°	.07	1°	.12	2'	.11	1°	.07
	2°	.14	2°	.43	2°	.19	3'	.15		
	3'	.14	6'	.48	3°	.26				
	4°	.21			6°	.32				
Smalltown	1°	.07	2°	.27	2°	.10	-	.07	1°	.10
	2'	.12	6°	.34					3°	.18
	3'	.14							6'	.24
	6'	.19								

°Significant at .00

'Significant at .05

FINE PRINT

Model 1, Social Homogeneity, was common to all locations for spending a social evening with friends, but a different model was the most significant. Model 3, Urbanism, was the most significant model downtown, Model 1, Social Homogeneity, in the suburbs, and Model 6, Contextual Variables, in smalltown.

Interpreting these results in the light of major population characteristics some commonalities are noted in social contact which takes place mainly outside the home. Model 2, Environmental Choice, was common downtown for organizational membership and both types of neighboring. This finding indicates that the younger, mobile, higher earning, couples/singles who rent townhouses/apartments downtown have the same basis for determining neighboring as organizational membership. For most of these residents, these types of social contact are largely determined by personal choice which is influenced by variables connected with the physical environment, values, and perceptions.

The residents of the suburbs are mostly older, longer resident married couples, with children, who own single family dwellings. Their organizational membership is mostly determined by personal characteristics which impinge on their life style such as commuting. Neighboring of both types, however, is largely determined by the social context of the area in which they live.

The social character of a place is the main factor influencing organizational membership and neighborhood adults known for residents of the smalltown. They are largely younger, newly arrived married couples who own single family dwellings. Chatting with neighbors for them is more a function of personal choice which is influenced by physical variables, values, and perceptions.

Spending a social evening with relatives is largely the result of personal characteristics for the younger mobile population downtown. But for suburban older marrieds with children, it is mostly a function of the presence of subcultures in the population.

The presence of subcultures in the population is the main basis for spending a social evening with friends for the younger mobile population downtown. That finding is distinct from the older, longer resident married couples in the suburbs whose friendship association is predicated on social homogeneity. Most of the younger married couples in smalltown spend a social evening with friends on the basis of the social context of the area in which they live.

In sum, a different model appears as the determinant of a particular type of social contact in each location. Some commonalities are observed across locations for types of social contact occuring, for the most part, outside the home. The unique differences in the findings, however, are overshadowed by the small amounts of variance explained, in particular, the result in socializing with relatives. The meaning of the findings in this regard is discussed in the conclusion which follows.

Conclusion

The surprising result of this study is the limited amount of variance explained by the models. The study followed directions established in the literature. Over fifty years of empirical research on the determinants of forms of social contact were reviewed. Operationalization of the variables in the data followed closely the majority of the specifications in the studies. Given the methodological rigor of the study completed, one is forced to conclude that the direction of empirical research on determinants of social contact is, for the most part, fruitless. The small total variances in several instances do not support a strong theoretical contention. Continued research is indicated where larger variances are evident. But that research should be supported by a search for more fruitful, alternate theories.

The overall result may also reflect earlier indications of an ethnographic bias in the determinants of social contact. The majority of empirical studies were undertaken in the United States of America. The findings of Garigue (1956) in Montreal, of Wayne (1972) in Toronto, and of Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) in England, produced results which differed to some extent from the U.S. data. Hence, the results of this study may be attributed to the testing of American-based models in Canadian data. The significance of Model 2, Environmental Choice, especially in the outdoor types of social contact, may be due to the origin of its specification. Michelson's (1970) model (Model 2) was based on empirical data from Toronto reviewed in the light of earlier findings in the United States. The implications and recommendations resulting from these conclusions are discussed after considering the limitations of this study.

This study suffers from two major limitations. The first is the lack of a rural sample. Without one it is not possible to properly test Wirth (1938). Hence, it is also not possible to provide evidence in support of Dewey's (1960) position that rural-urban differences are no longer important.

The second limitation results from the exclusion of the objective and subjective measures displayed earlier in Table 2.2. Without such measures, it is impossible to adequately resolve the determinants of forms of social contact. Given the relative strength of the value and perception variables of Model 2 in Tables 6.5 to 6.21 (Appendix E), it is not difficult to assume that the objective and subjective measures in Table 2.2 would display similar statistical strength when included in a similar analysis.

Other limitations may be the result of the way in which certain variables are operationalized. The overall result in terms of cumulative variance may be enhanced by further refinement of the variables used in the models. Recommendations in this regard are included at the end of this chapter. But concentrating on manipulating variables is a retrograde step in view of the theoretical imperative of the models. Now that the models have been tested according to specifications, the empirical and theoretical implications of the findings have to be assessed.

Implications of the Results for Empirical Research

It should be clear by now that the reliance of empirical studies on quantitative measures of the determinants of types of social contact is unfounded. Operationalization of future models has to be predicated on all the dimensions--quantitative and qualitative--inherent in Wirth's theory. In particular, it has to focus on the meaning dimension of urban life.

Implications of Results for Theory

Before addressing the implications of these results as a whole, their implications for Theory of Social Choice has to be considered. The results partially support the "Theory of Social Choice" recently developed by Kennedy (1982). He reformulated three theoretical models on the basis of the processes people go through in order to fulfill their life style choices (134). City environments contain a wide variety of physical characteristics. People's preferences for certain types of activities prompts them to choose environments conducive to their desired behavior. These three models, Social Homogeneity (Gans, 1968), Environmental Choice (Michelson, 1970), and Urbanism (Fischer, 1973), were described earlier (Chapter IV). Kennedy's reformulation based on choice is presented below.

Social Homogeneity, Model 1, was originated by Gans (1968:35,45). It proposes that social participation is based on social class or stage in the family life cycle. Kennedy notes (147) that, according to Gans, people choose to socialize on the basis of social homogeneity within life style groups. It is the most important factor in the creation of communities and social relationships. It is based on shared social characteristics, not house type or rural-urban location. In addition, Gans found that social homogeneity in the suburbs was based on income, education, or occupation.

Environmental Choice, Model 2, developed by Michelson (1970), states that social contact is facilitated according to life style based on economic, ethnic, and family life cycle criteria. Socializing is a function of people's values, perceptions, and certain variables connected with the physical environment. Kennedy notes (149-152) that people choose to socialize on the basis of their life style. Social factors lead to a choice of physical environments. These, in turn, may then affect social relationships.

Fischer (1975) argues, however, that the observations that account for the first two models (Gans,1968; Michelson,1970), may be explained on the basis of a third model he calls Urbanism. He argues that people socialize on the basis of ethnic, religious, or occupational subcultures strengthened by the size of the population.

In describing the processes associated with Fischer's model, Kennedy observes (1982:134-140) that as population size fosters subcultures, more people are able to find a set of behaviors and beliefs in common with others. This happens in two ways. First, large cities attract migrants and so ensure a constant supply of diversified people. Second, large cities produce structural differentiation. They facilitate the creation of a variety of social worlds, thus increasing the amount of choice people have in social contact.

With improved transportation and personal mobility in the city, people are no longer forced to maintain social contact in their immediate neighborhood but will maintain strong social ties outside their neighborhoods. In the suburbs, where distance becomes too great and subcultures are no longer supported by population density, people's personal social networks tend to become localized (138). People choose network associates and continue interaction as a positive function of commonalities and as a negative function of the cost of the interaction. Kennedy further notes (140) that as suburbs age, physical differences with older residential areas cease to exist. The distinguishing feature is no longer the location, but the people who live there.

Turning again to the results of the present study, they provide partial support of Kennedy's Theory of Social Choice. The result for at least one location supports the

Theory for each type of social contact. For organizational membership and neighboring, this support occurs in the downtown. Support for the Theory also occurs under chatting with neighbors in the smalltown. For spending a social evening with relatives and with friends, support occurs in the suburbs. It also is found under spending a social evening with friends in the downtown.

Considering the results from another perspective, out of five possible results for each location, the Theory of Social Choice is supported in four instances downtown, twice in the suburbs, and once in the smalltown. If we focus on all the models which achieved significance at each location, the Theory of Social Choice is supported in all instances but two. Both instances where there is a lack of support occur under spending a social evening with relatives. These are downtown, where only Model 4, Personal Characteristics, was significant and in smalltown where no significant result was obtained. Subject to replication and refinement (redefinition) of the models, the Theory of Social Choice is quite strongly supported in terms of the total occurrence of significant models, but not in the amounts of cumulative variance. What remains is a problem of definition and further empirical testing.

It was originally noted (Chapter IV) that the models were ordered on the basis of increasing numbers of independent variables and needed to be tested simultaneously. But Distance Effects, Model 5, had to be tested first. It was concluded that Distance Effects reflected social rather than physical differences. Using Model 5 as a control did enhance the results of testing the other models. Thus relegating Distance Effects to the role of a control leaves two models over and above those included under the Theory of Social Choice; Personal Characteristics, Model 4 and Contextual Variables, Model 6.

The way in which both of these models were operationalized in this study produced significant results at more than one location and in more than one type of social contact. It is not reasonable, therefore, to set aside these two models on the basis of existing evidence. What does have to be considered is the possibility of adding the models to the specification of the Theory of Social Choice, or, incorporating their specifications under one of the other models already included in the Theory.

The specifications of Personal Characteristics, Model 4, are quite distinct (Marshall,1973:127-133; Fischer and Jackson,1976:279,291,299) from those of the earlier Models, 1 through 3. But the type of characteristics referred to in the model are similar to Kennedy's elaboration (1982) of Michelson's (1970) Environmental Choice model. Michelson's (1970) specification of his model does not eliminate the possibility of including the Personal Characteristics of Model 4 under Model 2. There is simply insufficient information to make a decision. Further testing and refinement of the models in terms of their operationalization should clarify this decision.

Fischer and Jackson's (1976:279) specification of Contextual Variables, Model 6, is also distinct from the other models (Chapter IV). Its operationalization in this study, however, produced certain similarities with Urbanism, Model 3. Operationalization of the subcultural variables in Model 3 was achieved by calculating ethnic proportions of census tracts. Operationalization of Model 6 was orginally based on the proportion of youth and average income in the census tract. If it can be argued that these variables in fact reflect youth or income subcultures, then Model 6 may be placed under Model 3. The determination of that placement, however, should await further testing and refinement of the models, paying particular attention to the way in which the variables are operationalized.

Implications of Theory for Society

In discussing the implications of the 'Theory of Social Choice,' Kennedy (1982:153-157) observes that people are able to make choices as long as they can move around the city freely without restraint. This is true for those who have no financial or other impediment. Those with higher income levels, for example, would have few limitations on their choice of location. But those with lower income levels are not provided for by existing market forces. Government is forced to provide public housing for those with limited financial resources. Where people are constrained to live in public housing we are dealing with a theory of restricted choice.

Other restrictions on choice include lack of proper facilities for single parents, working women, play facilities for children, easy access to transportation, and poor or inappropriate design. Single parents and working women need shopping facilities that are open when they are not working. Many of them require more easily accessible day care services with special hours of operation. Properly equipped play areas for children are required with safe and improved access that avoids heavy traffic. Many single parents and working women need more convenient transportation. Often the location of affordable housing for those with limited financial means is far removed from better public transportation routes. Many of these types of needs may be settled if planning was integrated between city planners and transportation engineers.

Kennedy (157-159) also discussed the conditions for no choice. Two groups, the "deprived" and the "trapped" and downwardly mobile, were identified by Gans (1968:37). They lived in the inner city because they had no choice. The deprived included the very poor, the emotionally disturbed, broken families, and non-whites. The trapped were those who were left behind when the neighborhood was taken over by non-residential land users or lower status emigrants.

Also of note to planners, Kennedy observes (160) that density may have a positive interpretation. Very high densities can provide the required numbers of persons to support adequate recreational facilities that many people feel enhance urban life.

In supporting the Theory of Social Choice, as demonstrated earlier, the benefit of improving the conceptualization of the theoretical models becomes clear. The results of the data demonstrated support of a number of models with little or no direct implications for theory. The articulation of some of those models (Kennedy,1982) as the Theory of Social Choice, however, has raised the level of analysis. We can now consider what kinds of options are generally available in society and what kinds of restrictions exist. More importantly, it enables us to focus on the impediments or constraints that impair or prevent freedom of choice. As Kennedy notes (1982:134):

> The role of planners and architects in planning and designing these environments is important in establishing a congruence of individual needs and expectations with physical structures. All three of these perspectives emphasize the role of the individual and the demands that life styles place on the social and physical fabric of the city.

Recommendations

The limitations of this study and the implications discussed above may be resolved in the recommendations which follow. This study needs to be replicated and improved upon in several ways, perhaps not all at the same time. The preferred sequence is as follows:

1. Refine the models using the 1977 EAS and LAS data by eliminating redundant variables. This will also

facilitate the testing of increasing numbers of variables in the models.

2. Improve the operationalization of certain variables (e.g. age, length of residence) by testing several methods. This improvement may be resolved by using another method of analysis.
3. Construct scales which represent qualitative and quantitative dimensions of social contact. If the construction is successful, the scales should be substituted for existing dependent variables.
4. In view of the findings with Distance Effects, Model 5, the models should be tested at smaller areal levels to determine the extent and limits of the effects of, for example, social homogeneity and social context.
5. Ascertain the theoretical and empirical feasibility of collapsing the models in line with Kennedy's (1982) Theory of Social Choice.
6. Replicate the analysis of the refined models in other cities, small towns, and rural areas. If the theory is upheld, extend the replication to other countries to ascertain cultural or national effects.
7. Extend the analysis of the refined models by including social contact variables as independent variables and examining their interrelationships. This is particularly important if this extension is achieved including a rural sample. The specific postulates formulated by Wirth (1938) may then be formally and completely tested.

8. Examine the interrelationship of social contact and social support as indicated in the results under Situational Variables in Table 6.1. Support from relatives was eliminated in the present analysis due to loss of respondents. Under the improved models, with greater specification of variables, the loss of respondents may not be as crucial and the analysis can proceed.

The steps briefly described above are intended to maximize the analysis of the existing data. For purposes of replication and more extensive analysis, new data should be generated. It should attempt to answer the following questions:

1. How is the meaning (quality) of social contact perceived? Is one form of social contact favored more than another? Where and how do these preferences originate?
2. Is a certain model unique to a particular demographic type of population? Do models change as populations age?
3. Is a certain form of social contact preferred by a particular demographic type of population? Do these preferences change as populations age?
4. Are the models unique to a particular social context? What establishes the social context of a new subdivision?
5. The models indicate populations with different bases of social contact. Does this result from conscious choice,

the social context, or the population's earlier socialization? What is the role of early socialization in determining later social contact?

The foregoing are some of the problems that need to be resolved in order to further improve the specification of the Theory of Social Choice. Such an improvement will extend the implications of the theory for society. Hopefully, it will ultimately lead to the determination of a single theory of social choice.

REFERENCES

Adams, Bert N.
1968
Kinship in an Urban Setting. Chicago:Markham.

Alwin, Duane F. and Robert M. Hauser
1975
"The Decomposition of Effects in Path Analysis." American Sociological Review 40, 1 (February): 37-47.

Axelrod, Morris
1956
"Urban Structure and Social Participation." American Sociological Review 21, 1 (February): 13-18.

Bechtel, Robert B.
1975
"The Semantic Differential and Other Paper-and-Pencil Tests." Pp. 41-78 in William Michelson (ed.). Behavioral Research Methods in Environmental Design. Stroudsberg, Pa.:Dowden, Hutchinson and Ross.

Bell, Wendell
1958
"Social Choice, Life Styles, and Suburban Residence." Pp. 225-247 in William M. Dobriner (ed.) The Suburban Community. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

1956
"Familism and Suburbanization: One Test of the Social Choice Hypothesis." Rural Sociology 21, 2 (June): 276-283.

Bell, Wendell and Marion D. Boat
1957
"Urban Neighborhoods and Informal Social Relations." American Journal of Sociology 62, 4 (January): 391-398.

Bernard, Jessie
1937
"An Instrument for the Measurement of Neighborhood with Experimental Applications." Southwestern Social Science Quarterly 18, 2 (September): 145-158.

Brunner, Edmund deS. and John H. Kolb
1933
Rural Social Trends. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bushee, Frederick A.
1945
"Social Organizations in a Small City." American Journal of Sociology 51: 217-226.

Caplow, Theodore and Robert Forman
1950
"Neighborhood Interaction in a Homogeneous Community." American Sociological Review 15, 3 (June): 357-366.

Carpenter, Niles
1931
The Sociology of City Life. New York:Longmans, Green.

Clark, S.D.
1966
The Suburban Society. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Cohen, Albert K. and Harold M. Hodges, Jr.
1963
"Characteristics of the Lower-Blue-Collar-Class." Social Problems 10, 4 (Spring): 303-334.

Cooley, Charles Horton
1913
Social Organization: A Study of the Larger Mind. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Curson, P.H. and T.G. Bester
1972
"Urbanism as a Way of Life: Reality of Myth?" International Journal of Contemporary Sociology 9, 1 (January): 15-26.

Curtis, James
1971
"Voluntary Association Joining: A Cross-National Comparative Note." American Sociological Review 36, 5 (October): 872-880.

Curtis, Richard F.
1959a
"Occupational Mobility and Urban Social Life." Research Note. American Journal of Sociology 65, 3 (November): 296-298.

1959b
"Occupational Mobility and Membership in Formal Voluntary Associations: A Note on Research." American Sociological Review 24, 6 (December): 846-848.

Dewey, Richard
1960
"The Urban-Rural Continuum: Real but Relatively Unimportant." American Journal of Sociology 66, 1 (July):60-66.

1948
"Peripheral Expansion in Milwaukee County." American Journal of Sociology 54, 2 (September): 118-125.

Dobriner, William M.
1963
Class in Suburbia. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Dotson, Floyd
1951
"Patterns of Voluntary Association among Urban Working-Class Families." American Sociological Review 16, 5 (October): 687-693.

Durkheim, Emile
1933
The Division of Labor in Society. Translated by George Simpson. New York: Free Press.

Fava, Sylvia Fleis
1958
"Contrasts in Neighboring: New York City and a Suburban County." Pp. 122-131 in William M. Dobriner (ed.) The Suburban Community. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

1956
"Suburbanism as a Way of Life." American Sociological Review 21, 1 (February): 34-37.

Fischer, Claude S.
1981
"The Public and Private Worlds of City Life." American Sociological Review 46, 3 (June):306-316.

1975
"Toward a Subcultural Theory of Urbanism." American Journal of Sociology 80, 6 (May):1319-1341.

1972
"'Urbanism as a Way of Life:' A Review and an Agenda." Sociological Methods and Research 1, 2 (November): 187-242.

Fischer, Claude S. and Robert Max Jackson
1977
"Suburbanism and Localism." Pp. 117-138 in Fischer et al. Networks and Places: Social Relations in the Urban Setting. New York: Free Press.

1976
"Suburbs, Networks, and Attitudes." Pp. 279-307 in Barry Schwartz (ed.) The Changing Face of the Suburbs. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foley, Donald R.
1952
Neighbors or Urbanites? The Study of a Rochester Residential District. Rochester, N.Y.: University of Rochester, Department of Sociology. Studies of Metropolitan Rochester No. 2.

Form, William H., Joel Smith, Gregory P. Stone, and James Cowhig
1954
"The Compatibility of Alternative Approaches to the Delimitation of Urban Sub-Areas." American Sociological Review 19,4 (August): 434-440.

Foskett, John M.
1955
"Social Structure and Social Participation." American Sociological Review 20, 4 (August): 431-438.

Fox, Bonnie, John Fox, and Robert W. Marans
1980
"Residential Density and Neighbor Interaction." Sociological Quarterly 21, 3 (Summer): 349-359.

Freedman, Ronald and Deborah
1956
"Farm-Reared Elements in the Nonfarm Population." Rural Sociology 21, 1 (March): 50-61.

Freeman, Howard E., Edwin Novak and Leo G. Reeder
1957
"Correlates of Membership in Voluntary Associations." American Sociological Review 22, 5 (October): 528-533.

Gale, Dennis E.
1979
"Middle Class Resettlement in Older Urban Neighborhoods." Journal of the American Planning Association 45, 3 (July):293-304.

Gans, Herbert J.
1968
People and Plans: Essays on Urban Problems and Solutions. New York: Basic Books.

Garigue, Philip
1956
"French Canadian Kinship and Urban Life." American Anthropologist 58: 1090-1101.

Gibson, Geoffrey
1972
"Kin Family Network: Overheralded Structure in Past Conceptualizations of Family Functioning." Marriage and the Family 34, 1 (February): 13-23.

Giddings, Franklin Henry
1897
The Theory of Socialization. New York: MacMillan.

Gist, Noel P.
1952
"Ecological Decentralization and Rural-Urban Relationships." Rural Sociology 17, 3 (September): 328-335.

Gordon, Michael and C. Edward Noll
1975
"Social Class and Interaction with Kin and Friends." Journal of Comparative Family Studies 6, 2 (Autumn): 239-248.

Gordon, Robert A.
1968
"Issues in Multiple Regression." American Journal of Sociology 73 (March):592-616.

Greer, Scott
1956
"Urbanism Reconsidered: A Comparative Study of Local Areas in a Metropolis." American Sociological Review 21, 1 (February): 19-25.

Greer, Scott and Ella Kube
1959
"Urbanism and Social Structure." Pp.93 - 112 in Marvin B. Sussman (ed.) Community Structure and Analysis. New York: Thos. Y. Crowell.

Guterman, Stanley S.
1969
"In Defense of Wirth's 'Urbanism as a Way of Life.'" American Journal of Sociology 74, 4 (January): 492-499.

Hawley, Amos H.
1950
Human Ecology. New York: Ronald Press.

Heberle, Rudolf
1960
"The Normative Element in Neighborhood Relations." Pacific Sociological Review 3, 1 (Spring): 3-11.

1937
"The Sociology of Ferdinand Tonnies." American Sociological Review 2, 1 (February): 9-25.

Homans, George C.
1950
The Human Group. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Hyman, Robert H. and Charles R. Wright
1971
"Trends in Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Replication Based on Secondary Analysis of National Sample Surveys." American Sociological Review 36, 2 (April): 191-206.

Irving, Howard H.
1972
The Family Myth. Toronto: Copp Clark.

Kasarda, John D. and Morris Janowitz
1974
"Community Attachment in Mass Society." American Sociological Review 39, 3 (June): 328-339.

Kennedy, Leslie W.
1982
The Urban Kaleidoscope: Canadian Perspectives. Toronto: MCGraw-Hill forthcoming.

Kennedy, Leslie W. and Dennis W. Stokes
1981
"Social Relations in Changing Communities: A New Test of Old Theories." Edmonton: University of Alberta, Department of Sociology, Edmonton Areas Series No. 17.

Kennedy, Leslie W., Herbert C. Northcott and Clifford Kinzel
1977
"Quality of Life in Edmonton: Initial Findings from the 1977 Edmonton Area Study." Edmonton: University of Alberta, Department of Sociology, Edmonton Areas Series No. 1.

Key, William H.
1965
"Urbanism and Neighboring." Sociological Quarterly 6, 4 (Autumn): 379-385.

1961
"Rural-Urban Differences and the Family." Sociological Quarterly 2, 1 (January): 49-56.

Knupfer, Genevieve
1947
"Portrait of the Underdog." Public Opinion Quarterly 11 (Spring): 103-114.

Komarovsky, Mirra
1946
"The Voluntary Associations of Urban Dwellers." American Sociological Review 11, 6 (December): 686-698.

Kuper, Leo
1950
"Blueprint for Living Together." Pp. 1-202 in Kuper (ed.) Living in Towns. London: Cresset Press.

Lansing, John B., Robert W. Marans, and Robert B. Zehner
1970
Planned Residential Environments. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research.

Larson, Olaf F.
1938
"Rural Community Patterns of Social Participation." Social Forces 16, 3 (March): 385-388.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet
1948
[1944] The Peoples' Choice. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lee, Gary R.
1980
"Kinship in the Seventies: A Decade Review of Research and Theory." Marriage and the Family 42, 4 (November): 923-934.

1979
"Effects of Social Networks on the Family." Pp. 27-56 in Wesley R. Burr, Reuben Hill, F. Ivan Nye and Ira L. Reiss (eds.) Contemporary Theories About the Family. Vol. 1. New York: Free Press.

Litwak, Eugene
1961
"Voluntary Associations and Neighborhood Cohesion." American Sociological Review 26, 2 (April): 258-271.

1960a
"Occupational Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion." American Sociological Review 25, 1 (February): 9-21.

1960b
"Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion." American Sociological Review 25, 3 (June): 385-394.

Litwak, Eugene and Ivan Szelenyi
1969
"Primary Group Structures and Their Functions: Kin, Neighbors, and Friends." American Sociological Review 34, 4 (August): 465-481.

Logan, John R. and Moshe Semyonov
1980
"Growth and Succession in Suburban Communities." Sociological Quarterly 21, 1 (Winter): 93-105.

Long, Larry H.
1980
"Back to the Countryside and Back to the City in the Same Decade." Pp. 61-76 in Shirley Bradway Laska and Daphne Spain (eds.). Back to the City: Issues in Neighborhood Renovation. New York: Pergamon.

MacDonald, John S. and Leatrice D.
1974
"Chain Migration, Ethnic Neighborhood Formation and Social Networks." Pp. 226-236 in Charles Tilly (ed.) An Urban World. Boston: Little, Brown.

McVey, Wayne W. Jr.
1978
"Migration and the Smaller Community." Canadian Studies in Population 5: 13-23.

Mann, Peter H.
1954
"The Concept of Neighborliness." American Journal of Sociology 60, 2 (September): 163-168.

Marshall, Harvey
1973
"Suburban Life Styles: A Contribution to the Debate." Pp. 123-148 in Louis H. Masotti and Jeffrey K. Hadden (eds.) The Urbanization of the Suburbs. Vol. 7 Urban Affairs Annual Reviews. Beverly Hills, Cal.: Sage.

Martin, Walter T.
1956
"The Structuring of Social Relationships Engendered by Suburban Residence." American Sociological Review 21, 4 (August): 446-453.

1953
The Rural-Urban Fringe: A Study of Adjustment to Residence Location. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Press.

1952
"A Consideration of Differences in the Extent and Location of the Formal Associational Activities of Rural-Urban Fringe Residents." American Sociological Review 17, 6 (December): 687-694.

Mather, William G.
1941
"Income and Social Participation." American Sociological Review 6, 3 (June): 380-383.

Mayo, Elton
1949
The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization. London: Routledge and K. Paul.

Michelson, William
1977
Environmental Choice, Human Behavior, and Residential Satisfaction. New York: Oxford University Press.

1970
Man and His Urban Environment: A Sociological Approach. Don MIlls: Addison-Wesley.

Miller, Michael K. and Kelly W. Crader
1979
"Rural-Urban Differences in Two Dimensions of Community Satisfaction." Rural Sociology 44, 3 (Fall): 489-504.

Mogey, John
1977
"Content of Relations with Relatives." Pp. 413-429 in Jean Cuisenier (ed.) The Family Life Cycle in European Societies. The Hague: Mouton. New Babylon Studies in Social Sciences 28.

Morris, R.N.
1968
Urban Sociology. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Nie, Norman H., C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, & Dale H. Bent
1975
SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. 2nd Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nimkoff, Meyer F.
1947
Marriage and the Family. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Nohara, Shigeo
1968
"Social Context and Neighborliness: the Negro in St. Louis." Pp. 179-188 in Scott Greer, Dennis L. McElrath, David W. Minar and Peter Orleans (eds.). The New Urbanization. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Park, Robert E.
1928
"Human Migration and the Marginal Man." American Journal of Sociology 33, 6 (May): 881-893.

Parsons, Talcott
1959
[1949] "The Social Structure of the Family." Pp. 241-274 in Ruth Nanda Anskin (ed.) The Family: Its Function and Destiny. Revised Ed. New York: Harper and Bros.

1953
"A Revised Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification." Pp. 92-128 in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds.) Class, Status and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Payne, Raymond
1953
"Some Comparisons of Participation in Rural Mississipi, Kentucky, Ohio, Illinois, and New York." Research Note. Rural Sociology 18, 2 (June): 171-172.

Pfeil, E.
1968
"The Pattern of Neighbouring Relations in Dortmund-Nordstadt." Pp. 136-158 in RaymondE. Pahl (ed.). Readings in Urban Sociology. Oxford: Pergamon.

Pineo, Peter C.
1964
"The Extended Family in a Working-Class Area of Hamilton." Pp. 135-145 in Bernard R. Blishen, Frank E. Jones, Kaspar D. Naegele and John Porter (eds.) Canadian Society: Sociological Perspectives. Revised Ed. Toronto: MacMillan.

Pryor, Robin J.
1968
"Defining the Rural-Urban Fringe." Social Forces 47, 2 (December): 202-215.

Reiss, Paul J.
1962
"The Extended Kinship System: Correlates of and Attitudes on Frequency of Interaction." Marriage and Family Living 24, 4 (November): 333-339.

Reissman, Leonard
1954
"Class, Leisure, and Social Participation." American Sociological Review 19, 1 (February): 76-84.

Rodehaver, Myles W.
1947
"Fringe Settlement as a Two-Directional Movement." Rural Sociology 12, 1 (March): 49-57.

Rosow, Irving
1967
Social Integration of the Aged. New York: Free Press.

Saha, L.J.
1975
"Primary Group Support in Crisis Situations: Friends and Kin in Canberra Suburbs." Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology 11, 3 (October): 18-24.

Schulman, Norman
1976a
"Network Analysis: A New Addition to an Old Bag of Tricks." Acta Sociologica 19, 4 (December): 307-323.

1976b
"Role Differentiation in Urban Networks." Sociological Focus 9, 2 (April): 149-158.

Scott, John C. Jr.
1957
"Membership and Participation in Voluntary Associations." American Sociological Review 22, 3 (June): 315-326.

Shanas, Ethel
1967
"Family Help Patterns and Social Class in Three Countries." Marriage and the Family 29, 2 (May): 257-266.

Sharp, Harry and Morris Axelrod
1956
"Mutual Aid Among Relatives in an Urban Population." Pp. 433-439 in Ronald Freedman et al (eds.) Principles of Sociology. Revised Ed. New York:Holt.

Shils, Edward
1948
The Present State of American Sociology. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Shils, Edward and Morris Janowitz
1948
"Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht." Public Opinion Quarterly 12, 2 (Summer): 280-315.

Simmel, Georg
1950
"The Metropolis and Mental Life." Pp. 409-424 in Kurt H. Wolff (ed.) The Sociology of Georg Simmel. New York: Free Press.

Simmel, Georg [Translated by Everett C. Hughes]
1949
"The Sociology of Sociability." American Journal of Sociology 55, 3 (November): 254-261.

Sinclair, Peter R. and Kenneth Westhues
1974
Village in Crisis. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Smith, Joel, William H. Form and Gregory P. Stone
1954
"Local Intimacy in a Middle-Sized City." American Journal of Sociology 60, 3 (November): 276-284.

Stacey, Margaret
1969
"The Myth of Community Studies." British Journal of Sociology 20, 2 (June): 134-147.

Sussman, Marvin B.
1953
"The Help Pattern in the Middle Class Family." American Sociological Review 18, 1 (February): 22- 28.

Sussman, Marvin B. and Lee Burchinal
1962
"Kin Family Network: Unheralded Structure in Current Conceptualizations of Family Functioning." Marriage and the Family 24, 3 (August): 231-240.

Sutcliffe, J.P. and B.D. Crabbe
1963
"Incidence and Degrees of Friendship in Urban and Rural Areas." Social Forces 42, 1 (October): 60-67.

Tallman, Irving and Ramona Morgner
1970
"Life-Style Differences among Urban and Suburban Blue-Collar Families." Social Forces 48, 3 (March): 334-348.

Thomas, W. I.
1966
On Social Organization and Social Personality. Morris Janowitz (ed.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thorns, David C.
1975
"Suburban Values and the Urban System." International Journal of Comparative Sociology 16, 1-2: 100-113.

Toennies, Ferdinand
1957
[1887] Community and Society. Charles P. Loomis (ed.) East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University Press.

Tomeh, Aida K.
1967
"Informal Participation in a Metropolitan Community." Sociological Quarterly 8, 1 (Winter): 85-102.

1964
"Informal Group Participation and Residential Patterns." American Journal of Sociology 70, 1 (July): 28-35.

Townsend, Peter
1957
The Family Life of Old People. London: Routledge and K. Paul.

Tremblay, Kenneth R. Jr., Don A. Dillman and Kent D. Van Liere
1980
"An Examination of the Relationship between Housing Preferences and Community-Size Preferences." Rural Sociology 45, 3 (Fall):509-519.

Waller, Willard and Reuben Hill
1951
The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation. Revised Ed. New York: Dryden Press.

Wallin, Paul
1953
"A Guttman Scale for Measuring Women's Neighborliness." American Journal of Sociology 59, 3 (November): 243-246.

Wayne, Jack
1972
"The Case of the Friendless Urbanite." Pp. 80-92 in Alan Powell (ed.) The City: Attacking Modern Myths. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

Wehrwein, George S.
1942
"The Rural-Urban Fringe." Economic Geography 18, 3 (July): 217-228.

Wellman, Barry
1979
"The Community Question: The Intimate Networks of East Yorkers." American Journal of Sociology 84, 5 (March): 1201-1231.

Whetten, Nathan L.
1951
"Suburbanization as a Field for Sociological Research." Rural Sociology 16, 4 (December): 319-330.

Wilson, James Q.
1968
"The Urban Unease: Community versus City." The Public Interest 12 (Summer): 25-39.

Winch, Robert F. and Scott A. Greer
1968
"Urbanism, Ethnicity, and Extended Familism." Marriage and the Family 30, 1 (February): 40-45.

Wirth, Louis
1938
"Urbanism as a Way of Life." American Journal of Sociology 44, 1 (July): 1-24.

1926
"The Sociology of Ferdinand Tonnies." American Journal of Sociology 32, 3 (November): 412-422.

Wright, Charles R. and Herbert H. Hyman
1958
"Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Evidence from National Sample Surveys." American Sociological Review 23, 3 (June): 284-294.

Zimmer, Basil G.
1955
"Participation of Migrants in Urban Structures." American Sociological Review 20, 2 (April): 218-224.

Zimmer, Basil G. and Amos H. Hawley
1959
"The Significance of Membership in Associations." American Journal of Sociology 65, 2 (September): 196-201.

Zito, Jacqueline M.
1974
"Anonymity and Neighboring in an Urban, High-Rise Complex." Urban Life and Culture 3, 3 (October): 243-263.

Zuiches, James J.
1970
"In-Migration and Growth of Non-Metropolitan Urban Places." Rural Sociology 35, 3(September): 410-420.

APPENDIX A

VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP

Non-Generalizable

Classification. Brunner and Kolb (1933:247).

Sex (gender). Mather (1941:380), Bushee (1945:218), Komarovsky (1946:688-690), Dotson (1951:689), Tallman and Morgner (1970:340).

Income. Mather (1941:380).

Urban-Rural Location. Bushee (1945:221), Gist (1952:330-333), Payne (1953:172), Tallman and Morgner (1970:340).

Profession. Bushee (1945:224).

Social Class. Komarovsky (1946:688), Knupfer (1947:105), Litwak (1960a:19).

Economic Class. Komarovsky (1946:689-690).

Reason for Moving. Rodehaver (1947:54-56).

Age. Rodehaver (1947:54-56).

Length of Residence. Rodehaver (1947:54-56).

Marital Status. Dotson (1951:691).

Amount of Neighboring. Gans (1968:134).

Generalizable

Urban-Rural Location. Larson (1938:386-387), Foley (1952:23), Foskett (1955:432-436), Freedman (1956:56-60), Greer (1956:22), Bell and Boat (1957:392), Wright and Hyman (1958:290), Zimmer and Hawley (1959:198), Curtis (1971:877).

Social Class. Lazarsfeld, Berelson and Gaudet (1948[1944]:173), Martin (1952:693), Bell and Boat (1957:392), Freeman, Novak and Reeder (1957:529), Scott (1957:321), Curtis (1959b:848), Litwak (1961:268), Cohen and Hodges (1963:315).

Occupation. Foley (1952:24-27), Martin (1953:78), Reissman (1954:80), Zimmer (1955:219), Axelrod (1956:15), Scott (1957:321), Wright and Hyman (1958:289), Zimmer and Hawley (1959:199), Hyman and Wright (1971:202).

Education. Foley (1952:24-27), Martin (1953:78), Reissman (1954:80), Foskett (1955:433-434), Zimmer (1955:219), Axelrod (1956:15), Scott (1957:321), Wright and Hyman (1958:289), Zimmer and Hawley (1959:199), Hyman and Wright (1971:198).

Tenure. Foley (1952:24-27), Freeman, Novak and Reeder (1957:529), Scott (1957:321), Wright and Hyman (1958:289).

Religion. Foley (1952:24-27), Scott (1957:321), Wright and Hyman (1958:287).

Life Cycle. Foley (1952:24-27).

Length of Residence. Martin (1952:693), Zimmer (1955:219,221), Scott (1957:321), Wright and Hyman (1958:292), Zimmer and Hawley (1959:199), Kasarda and Janowitz (1974:334), Sinclair and Westhues (1974:100).

Location of Previous Residence. Martin (1952:693).

Sex (Gender). Martin (1953:78;1956:449), Scott (1957:318-320), Townsend (1957:125), Curtis (1959b:848;1971:874).

Income. Reissman (1954:80), Foskett (1955:433-436), Axelrod (1956:15), Freedman (1956:59-60), Freeman, Novak and Reeder (1957:529), Wright and Hyman (1958:289), Zimmer and Hawley (1959:199), Hyman and Wright (1971:198,202).

Age. Foskett (1955:435-436), Zimmer (1955:219), Scott (1957:321), Townsend (1957:125), Zimmer and Hawley (1959:199), Curtis (1971:877), Hyman and Wright (1971:197).

Migrant Type. Zimmer (1955:221).

Informal Social Relations. Axelrod (1956:18).[1]

Commuters/Non-commuters. Martin (1956:448).

Residential/Job Mobility. Freeman, Novak and Reeder (1957:529).

Attitudes towards Community. Freeman, Novak and Reeder (1957:529).

Family Status. Bell and Boat (1957:392), Scott (1957:321), Townsend (1957:125), Wright and Hyman (1958:292), Zimmer and Hawley (1959:199), Curtis (1971:877).

Marital Status. Scott (1957:321), Townsend (1957:125), Curtis (1971:877).

Number of Friends. Scott (1957:321).

Ethnicity. Scott (1957:321), Wright and Hyman (1958:287), Zimmer and Hawley (1959:199), Curtis (1971:874).

Family versus Adult Membership. Wright and Hyman (1958:287).

Urbanization. Wright and Hyman (1958:290).

House Type. Wright and Hyman (1958:292).

Social-Occupational Mobility. Curtis (1959b:848).

Fertility Ratio. Greer and Kube (1959:103).

% Single Family Dwellings. Greer and Kube (1959:103).

% Women Working. *Greer and Kube (1959:103).*

[1] Underlined references represent negative findings.

APPENDIX B

VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH NEIGHBORING

Non-Generalizable

Children (Family Life Cycle, Status). Bernard (1937:146), Dewey (1948:121-122), Kuper (1950:42-66), Zito (1974:259).

Tenure. Bernard (1937:146).

Mobility (Length of Residence). Bernard (1937:156), Wallin (1953:244-245).

Proportion over 65. Bernard (1937:154).

House Type. Bernard (1937:156).

Population Density. Bernard (1937:156).

Social Class. Kuper (1950:42-66), Litwak (1960a:19), Thorns (1975:108-109).

Income. Kuper (1950:42-66), Gans (1968:148).

Education. Kuper (1950:42-66), Wallin (1953:244-245), Gans (1968:148).

Occupation. Kuper (1950:42-66), Litwak and Szelenyi (1969:480-481).

Sex (Gender). Kuper (1950:42-66), Tallman and Morgner (1970:339).

Urban-Rural Location. Gist (1952:330-333), Clark (1966:185), Tallman and Morgner (1970:339).

Age. Wallin (1953:244-245).

Marital Status. Wallin (1953:244-245).

Propinquity. Gans (1968:152).

Type of Help. Litwak and Szelenyi (1969:480-481).

Wife Works. Zito (1974:259).

Proximity of Kin. [for neighbors help] Lee (1979:51).

Generalizable.

House Type. Caplow and Forman (1950:360), Pfeil (1968:157-158), Lansing et al (1970:116), Fischer and Jackson (1976:291-293).

Social Homogeneity. Caplow and Forman (1950:360,366), Foley (1952:36).

Urban-Rural Location. Caplow and Forman (1950:366), Gist (1952:330-333), Foskett (1955:432-436), Greer (1956:22), Bell and Boat (1957:394), Fava (1958:125), Tomeh (1964:34), Kasarda and Janowitz (1974:334), Fischer and Jackson (1976:291-293).

Children (Family Life Cycle, Status). Foley (1952:36), Bell and Boat (1957:394), Tomeh (1967:91), Fischer and Jackson (1976:291-293), Fox et al (1980:356).

Mobility (Length of Residence). Foley (1952:36), Smith et al (1954:282), Fava (1958:124-125), Tomeh (1967:99), Pfeil (1968:157-158), Kasarda and Janowitz (1974:334), Fischer and Jackson (1976:291-293), Fox et al (1980:356).

Propinquity. Foley (1952:36), Cohen and Hodges (1963:312).

Relatives. Foley (1952:36).

Own Car. Foley (1952:36),[1] Fischer and Jackson (1976:291-293).

Social Class (Status). Smith et al (1954:279), Axelrod (1956:16-17), Bell and Boat (1957:394), Townsend (1957:121,123), Cohen and Hodges (1963:312), Dobriner (1963:118), Rosow (1967:243), *Wayne (1972:90).*

Demographic or Social. Form et al (1954:438).

Age of District. Form et al (1954:438-439)

Ethnicity. Form et al (1954:438-439), Axelrod (1956:16-17), Fava (1958:125), Dobriner (1963:118), Tomeh (1967:91), Fischer and Jackson (1976:291-293).

Mobility (No. of Moves). Smith et al (1954:282).

Income . Foskett (1955:433-436), Axelrod (1956:16-17), Tomeh (1967:94), Fischer and Jackson (1976:291-293), Fox et al (1980:356).

Education. Foskett (1955:433-435), Axelrod (1956:16-17), Fava (1958:125), Tomeh (1964:34;1967:94), Fischer and Jackson (1976:291-293), Fox et al (1980:356).

Age. Foskett (1955:435-436), Townsend (1957:121,123), Fava (1958:124-125), Curtis (1959a:297), Tomeh (1964:34;1967:91), Kasarda and Janowitz (1974:334), Fischer and Jackson (1976:291-293), Fox et al (1980:356).

Occupation. Axelrod (1956:16-17), Curtis (1959a:297), Tomeh (1967:94), Fischer and Jackson (1976:291-293).

Social Status. Axelrod (1956:16-17).

Type of Socializing. Axelrod (1956:18), Tomeh (1967:90).

Sex (Gender). Martin (1956:449), Townsend (1957:121,123), Fava (1958:125), Rosow (1967:243), Tomeh (1967:91), Fischer and Jackson (1976:291-293).

Commuters/Non-commuters. Martin (1956:448).

Marital Status. Townsend (1957:121,123), Fava (1958:124-125), Tomeh (1964:34;1967:91), Rosow (1967:243), Fox et al (1980:356).

Tenure. Fava (1958:124).

Occupational Mobility. Curtis (1959a:297).

Fertility Ratio. Greer and Kube (1959:103).

% Single Family Dwellings. Greer and Kube (1959:103).

% Women Working. Greer and Kube (1959:103).

Religion. Dobriner (1963:118), Tomeh (1967:98), Fischer and Jackson (1976:291-293).

Town Native. Tomeh (1964:34).

Community Size. Key (1965:383).

Health. Rosow (1967:243).

Parents' Role Loss. [increased neighboring when parents' role is finished] Rosow (1967:243).

Neighborhood Satisfaction. Lansing et al (1970:120).

Wife Works. Fischer and Jackson (1976:291-293).

Tract Income. Fischer and Jackson (1976:291-293).

Population Density. Fox et al (1980:356).

Public Open Space. Fox et al (1980:356).

Private Open Space. Fox et al (1980:356).

Density by Private Open Space Interaction. Fox et al (1980:356).

Urbanism. Fischer (1981:315).

[1] Underlined references represent negative findings.

APPENDIX C

VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIALIZING WITH KIN Non-Generalizable.

Urban-Rural Location. Gist (1952:330-333), Garigue (1956:1098).

Type of Help. Sussman (1953:27-28), Litwak and Szelenyi (1969:480-481).

Social Class. Sussman (1953:27-28), Litwak (1960a:15,16,19), Sussman and Burchinal (1962:240), Thorns (1975:108-109), Lee (1980:927).

Proximity (Relatives in town). Litwak (1960a:15-16), Litwak and Szelenyi (1969:480-481), Mogey (1977:425), Lee (1980:928).

Age. Litwak (1960a:15-16), Lee (1979:51;1980:930).

Family Values. Sussman and Burchinal (1962:240).

Income. Sussman and Burchinal (1962:240).

Family Structure. Sussman and Burchinal (1962:240).

Type of Socializing. Sussman and Burchinal (1962:240).

Community. Wilson (1968:28).

Occupation. Litwak and Szelenyi (1969:480-481).

Ethnicity. MacDonald (1974:236), Lee (1980:926).

Family Life Cycle. Mogey (1977:425).

Length of Residence. Lee (1979:46).

Social Mobility. Lee (1980:927).

Sex (Gender). Lee (1980:930).

Marital Status. Lee (1980:930).

Generalizable.

Urban-Rural Location. Bell (1956:283), Greer (1956:22), Bell and Boat (1957:394), Bell (1958:247), Key (1961:54), Tomeh (1964:34), Adams (1968:38,44), Winch and Greer (1968:45), Kasarda and Janowitz (1974:334), Fischer and Jackson (1976:290).

Type of Help. Sharp and Axelrod (1956:438-439).

Income. Axelrod (1956:16-17), Tomeh (1967:94).

Occupation. Axelrod (1956:16-17), Tomeh (1967:94), Adams (1968:99).

Ethnicity. Axelrod (1956:16-17), Reiss (1962:338),[1] Tomeh (1967:91), Winch and Greer (1968:45).

Social Status. Axelrod (1956:16-17).

Education. Axelrod (1956:16-17), Tomeh (1964:34;1967:94).

Type of Socializing. Axelrod (1956:18), Tomeh (1967:90).

Closer Relatives (siblings-parents). Sharp and Axelrod (1956:438-439), Reiss (1962:338).

Social Class. Bell and Boat (1957:394), Townsend (1957:119), Reiss (1962:338), Cohen and Hodges (1963:309-310), Pineo (1964:144-145), Shanas (1967:266), Winch and Greer (1968:45, Wayne (1972:90), Gordon and Noll (1975:242-243).

Age. Townsend (1957:119), Tomeh (1964:34;1967:91), Gibson (1972:20-21), Kasarda and Janowitz (1974;334) [is curvilinear with R2].

Family Type (Structure, Children). Bell and Boat (1957:394), Shanas (1967:266), Tomeh (1967:91), Gibson (1972:20-21).

Sex (Gender). Townsend (1957:119), Reiss (1962:338),. Rosow (1967:243),. Tomeh (1967:91), Adams (1968:38,44,99).

Fertility Ratio. Greer and Kube (1959:103).

% Single Family Dwellings. Greer and Kube (1959:103).

% Women Working. Greer and Kube (1959:103).

Proximity (Relatives in Town). *Litwak (1960b:393),* Reiss (1962:338).

Family Life Cycle. *Reiss (1962:338),* Pineo (1964:144-145), Shanas (1967:266).

Own Car. Pineo (1964:144-145).

Town Native. Tomeh (1964:34).

Marital Status. Tomeh (1964:34), *Rosow (1967:243),* Shanas (1967:266), Tomeh (1967:91), Gibson (1972:20-21).

Length of Residence. Tomeh (1967:99), Winch and Greer (1968:45), Kasarda and Janowitz (1974:334).

Health. *Rosow (1967:243).*

Parents' Role Loss. Rosow (1967:243).

Religion. Tomeh (1967:98).

Emotional Reliance. Irving (1972:48-51).

Years Married. Irving (1972:60).

[1] Underlined references represent negative findings.

APPENDIX D

VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIALIZING WITH FRIENDS

Non-Generalizable.

Rural-Urban Location. Gist (1952:330-333).

Education. Gans (1968:148).

Income. Gans (1968:148).

Social Homogeneity. Gans (1968:152).

Type of Help. Litwak and Szelenyi (1969:480-481).

Occupation. Litwak and Szelenyi (1969:480-481).

Relatives in Town. Litwak and Szelenyi (1969:480-481).

Family Life Cycle. Michelson (1970:110).

Social Class. Michelson (1970:118), Thorns (1975:108-109).

Peoples' Values. Michelson (1970:146).

Length of Residence. Lee (1979:46).

Generalizable.

Mobility (No.of Moves). Smith et al (1954:282).

Length of Residence. Smith et al (1954:284), Tomeh (1967:99), Kasarda and Janowitz (1974:334), Fischer and Jackson (1976:298-299).

Education. Axelrod (1956:16-17), Tomeh (1964:34;1967:94).

Income. Axelrod (1956:16-17), Sutcliffe and Crabbe (1963:66-67), Tomeh (1967:94).

Occupation. Axelrod (1956:16-17), Curtis (1959a:297), Tomeh (1967:94), Fischer and Jackson (1976:298-299).

Ethnicity. Axelrod (1956:16-17), Tomeh (1967:91), Fischer and Jackson (1976:298-299).

Social Status. Axelrod (1956:16-17).

Type of Socializing. *Axelrod (1956:18),*[1] *Scott (1957:321), Tomeh (1967:90).*

Urban-Rural Location. Greer (1956:22), Bell and Boat (1957:394), *Sutcliffe and Crabbe (1963:66-67),* Tomeh (1964:34), Kasarda and Janowitz (1974:334), Fischer and Jackson (1976:298-299).

Social Class. Bell and Boat (1957:394), Townsend (1957:121,123), Gordon and Noll (1975:242-243).

Family Life Cycle/Children. Bell and Boat (1957:394), Tomeh (1967:91),Wayne (1972:90), Fischer and Jackson (1976:298-299).

Sex (Gender). Townsend (1957:121,123), Sutcliffe and Crabbe (1963:66-67), Tomeh (1967:91).

Marital Status. Townsend (1957:121,123), Tomeh (1964:34;1967:91).

Age. Townsend (1957:121,123), Curtis (1959a:297), Tomeh (1964:34;1967:91), Kasarda and Janowitz (1974:334), Fischer and Jackson (1976:298-299).

Occupational Mobility. Curtis (1959a:297).

Fertility Ratio. Greer and Kube (1959:103) [No relationship].

% Single Family Dwelling. Greer and Kube (1959:103) [No relationship].

% Women Working. Greer and Kube (1959:103) [No relationship].

Town Native. Tomeh (1964:34).

Religion. Tomeh (1967:98).

Population Size. Guterman (1969:497).

Tract Youth. Fischer and Jackson (1976:298-299).

Wife Works. Fischer and Jackson (1976:298-299).

Urbanism. *Fischer (1981:315).*

---

[1] Underlined references represent negative findings.

APPENDIX E

Table 6.4 Variables Used and Coding

Variables Used and Coding	EAS	LAS
Model 1		
Age - years	2	2
Marital Status - No Spouse=0/Spouse=1	2	3
Children - No Child=0/Child=1	2	2
Empty Nesters - Parents 30+, No Children=1/ Others=0	2	2
Occupation/Social Class - White=1/Blue=2	52	67
Model 2		
Income - Coded Household Income	76	118
Ethnicity - British=1/Other=0	10	9
Tenure - Owns=1/Other=2	13	19
House Type - Multiple=0/Single=1	Q1	Q1
Length of Residence - Years	12	11
Shelter Cost - $ per Month	18/22	25/28
Population Density - % Apartments in Tract		
Age of Neighborhood - Years, from Census		
Attitudes towards Community: Scaled 1 - 7		
:Attractive(1) - Unattractive(7)	77	119
:Unfriendly(1) - Friendly(7)	77	119
:Crowded(1) - Uncrowded(7)	77	119
:Good Place(1) - Poor Place(7)	77	119
:Pleasant(1) - Unpleasant(7)	77	119
:Big City(1) - Rural(7)	77	119
:Nothing to do(1) - Lots to do(7)	77	119
:Hard to get around(1) - Easy(7)	77	119
:Good place for children - Poor place(7)	77	119
:Safe(1) - Unsafe(7)	77	119
:Poor Climate(1) - Good(7)	77	119
:Clean air(1) - Dirty air(7)	77	119
Peoples Values: Scaled Very Dissatisfied=1 - Very Satisfied=7		
Non-Working Activities	33	64
Family Life	33	64
Health/Physical Condition	33	64
Activity Time	33	64
Friendships	33	64
Standard of Living	33	64
In General	33	64
Job Satisfaction	58	76
Residential Satisfaction	17	24
Desire to Move	20	16
Neighborhood Satisfaction	24	30

Table 6.4 (Continued)

Variables Used and Coding	EAS	LAS
Model 3		
Religiosity - Strong=1/Less=2	8	7
Religious Attendance - Never=0/Highest=7	9	8
Tract Ethnicity - % British - % German - % Ukranian		
Model 4		
Sex - Male=1/Female=2	2	2
Education - Years	5/6	5
Wife Working - Wife Working=1/Other=0	54	71
Model 5		
Location - from 1976 Municipal Census Tracts: Downtown=Tract nos. 20 - 23, 30 - 36, 39, 43 - 48, 53 - 57, 60 - 63. Suburbs =Tract nos. 1 - 19, 24 - 29, 37, 38, 40 - 42, 49 - 52, 58, 59, 64 - 90.		
Model 6		
Total Persons in Household	1	1
Tract 65 and over - % 65 and Over		
Tract Youth - % Youth		
Tract Income - Mean Income		
Social Homogeneity - Difference between personal and Tract income - Heterogeneous=1/ Homogeneous=2		
Dependent Variables		
Neighboring: Adults Known - All=1/None=7	27	34
:Chat w/ Neighbors - Daily=1/ Never=5	28	35
Socialize with Friends - Daily=1/Never=5	29	45
Socialize with Kin - Daily=1/Never=5	30	52
Entertainment Frequency - Daily=1/Never=5	31	55
Organizational Membership - None=0/One or or more=1	65	82

Table 6.5 Standard Structural Equations for Organizational Membership

Downtown, Edmonton (n = 118)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Marital Status	-.17'	-.13	-.12	-.11	-.15
Occupation/Social Class	-.09	-.02	-.01	.05	.09
Income	.14	.09	.09	.07	.09
Ethnicity British		.02	.02	.01	.03
Ethnicity Ukrainian		-.03	-.03	-.03	-.01
House Type		-.20'	-.19'	-.18'	-.24'
Length of Residence		.04	.03	.10	.09
Shelter Cost		.10	.10	.13	.13
Population Density		-.10	-.09	-.10	-.20'
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.13	-.13'	-.13'	-.13'
Good place, children - Poor		-.22'	-.22'	-.21'	-.23'
Desire to Move		-.20'	-.19'	-.17'	-.22'
Religious Attendance			.03	.01	.01
Tract Ethnicity British			.04	.01	.06
Sex				-.06	-.05
Education				.20'	.18'
Wifeworks				.01	.06
Total Persons in Household					.09
Tract 65 and Over					.18'
Social Mix					.07
r^2 =	.05	.18	.18	.21	.24

'Significant at .05

Table 6.6 Standard Structural Equations for Organizational Membership

Suburbs, Edmonton (n = 216)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Marital Status	.07	.07	.06	.04	.08
Occupation/Social Class	-.12'	-.12'	-.14'	-.07	-.04
Income	.11	.13'	.13'	.09	.12'
Ethnicity British		.07	.09	.07	.05
Ethnicity German		-.10'	-.10'	-.10'	-.10'
Length of Residence		.18'	.16'	.15'	.14'
Shelter Cost		.09	.09	.05	.02
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.11'	-.13'	-.13'	-.15'
Safe - Unsafe		-.17'	-.16'	-.15'	-.14'
Religious Attendance			.16'	.15'	.15'
Sex				-.01	-.01
Education				.25'	.23'
Wifeworks				.05	.05
House Type				.09	.09
Total Persons in Household					-.08
Tract Income					.14'
Social Mix					-.03
r^2 =	.05	.14	.16	.21	.23

'Significant at .05

Table 6.7 Standard Structural Equations for Organizational Membership

Small Town, Leduc (n = 254)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Marital Status	.01	-.04	-.05	-.03	-.01
Family Status	.04	.04	.02	.06	.07
Occupation/Social Class	-.17[1]	-.16[1]	-.16[1]	-.16[1]	-.15[1]
Family Income	.11	.12[1]	.14[1]	.08	.07
Ethnicity British		.10[1]	.11[1]	.10[1]	.11[1]
Ethnicity German		.03	.02	.02	.03
Shelter Cost		-.01	-.00	.01	.02
Quality of Life Satisfaction		.19[1]	.17[1]	.20[1]	.20[1]
Easy to get around - Hard		.09[1]	.07	.09[1]	.10[1]
Desire to Move		-.11[1]	-.12[1]	-.11[1]	-.09[1]
Religious Attendance			.15[1]	.15[1]	.14[1]
Sex				-.16[1]	-.17[1]
Education				.05	.10
Wifeworks				-.04	-.03
House Type				-.03	.01
Length of Residence					.04
Tract 65 and Over					-.17[1]
Social Mix					.01
r^2 =	.07	.12	.14	.16	.19

[1] Significant at .05

Table 6.8 Standard Structural Equations for Neighborhood Adults Known

Downtown, Edmonton (n = 121)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Marital Status	-.09	-.10	-.11	-.06	-.05
Occupation/Social Class	-.18'	-.14'	-.15'	-.18'	-.22'
Income	.01	.01	.02	.02	-.05
Ethnicity British		.06	.03	.04	.02
Ethnicity Ukrainian		.15'	.14'	.13'	.13'
Length of Residence		-.17'	-.16'	-.15'	-.16'
Shelter Cost		.21'	.20'	.19'	.19'
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.07	-.07	-.09	-.09
Uncrowded - Crowded		.20'	.19'	.16'	.14'
Religious Attendance			-.09	-.09	-.11
Tract Ethnicity British			-.06	-.06	-.07
Sex				.07	.08
Education				.12	.11
Wifeworks				-.11	-.13
House Type				.07	.10
Social Mix					-.15'
r^2 =	.04	.21	.22	.24	.26

'Significant at .05

Table 6.9 Standard Structural Equations for Neighborhood Adults Known

Suburbs, Edmonton (n = 217)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Marital Status	-.27'	-.17'	-.15'	-.15'	-.09'
Occupation/Social Class	-.02	-.04	-.01	-.05	-.06
Income	.00	.01	.01	.02	.06
Ethnicity British		-.03	-.05	-.05	-.05
Ethnicity Ukrainian		-.16'	-.14'	-.14'	-.14'
Length of Residence		-.48'	-.48'	-.48'	-.46'
Shelter Cost		-.02	-.03	-.01	.01
Population Density		.15'	.16'	.17'	.16'
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.08'	-.08'	-.08'	-.10'
Attractive - Unattractive		.12'	.13'	.12'	.12'
Religious Attendance			-.06	-.06	-.05
Tract Ethnicity British			.09'	.11'	.10'
Sex				-.04	-.03
Education				-.12'	-.12'
Wifeworks				-.01	-.03
House Type				-.01	.00
Total Persons in Household					-.17'
Social Mix					-.04
r^2 =	.07	.43	.44	.45	.48

'Significant at .05

Table 6.10 Standard Structural Equations for Neighborhood Adults Known

Small Town, Leduc (n = 257)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Age	-.17[1]	.10[1]	.11[1]	.13[1]	.10
Marital Status	-.07	-.01	.00	.03	.07
Occupation/Social Class	.06	.05	.05	.02	.04
Family Income	-.07	-.04	-.05	.04	.04
Ethnicity British		-.07	-.07	-.08	-.05
Ethnicity German		-.00	.00	-.01	.01
Tenure		.16[1]	.14[1]	.12[1]	.16[1]
Length of Residence		-.33[1]	-.33[1]	-.30[1]	-.33[1]
Shelter Cost		.08	.07	.10[1]	.13[1]
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.27[1]	-.25[1]	-.24[1]	-.25[1]
Uncrowded - Crowded		-.16[1]	-.16[1]	-.16[1]	-.15[1]
Religious Attendance			-.11[1]	-.10[1]	-.09[1]
Tract Ethnicity Ukrainian			-.03	-.00	.11[1]
Sex				-.07	-.05
Education				-.01	-.03
Wifeworks				-.05	-.07
House Type				-.14[1]	-.07
Total Persons in Household					-.17[1]
Tract 65 and Over					.18[1]
Social Mix					-.08[1]
r^2 =	.03	.27	.28	.30	.34

[1] Significant at .05

Table 6.11 Standard Structural Equations for Chat with Neighbors

Downtown, Edmonton (n = 121)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Age	-.18'	-.17'	-.19'	-.20'	-.18'
Occupation/Social Class	-.03	-.02	.01	-.08	-.11
Income	.03	.13	.15'	.14	.14
Ethnicity British		-.01	.04	.06	.06
Ethnicity Ukrainian		.19'	.21'	.20'	.23'
Shelter Cost		-.02	-.02	-.04	-.09
Desire to Move		.14	.17'	.14'	.14'
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.16'	-.16'	-.19'	-.21'
Nothing to do - Lots		-.16'	-.21'	-.19'	-.21'
Religious Attendance			.13'	.13'	.11
Tract Ethnicity Ukrainian			-.12'	-.14'	-.17'
Sex				-.03	-.04
Education				.02	.04
Wifeworks				-.13'	-.15'
House Type				.17'	.07
Total Persons in Household					.22'
Tract Youth					.05
Social Mix					.02
r^2 =	.04	.13	.16	.18	.22

'Significant at .05

Table 6.12 Standard Structural Equations for Chat with Neighbors

Suburbs, Edmonton (n = 215)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Marital Status	-.24'	-.20'	-.20'	-.19'	-.16'
Occupation/Social Class	-.11'	-.10'	-.07	-.12'	-.09
Emptynest	-.14'	-.09	-.06	-.06	.03
Income	-.03	-.05	-.04	-.02	.02
Ethnicity British		-.03	-.05	-.05	-.07
Ethnicity Ukrainian		-.01	.05	.05	.04
Length of Residence		-.20'	-.20'	-.21'	-.22'
Shelter Cost		.05	.02	.05	.04
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.14'	-.19'	-.19'	-.23'
Easy to get around - Hard		-.14'	-.13'	-.13'	-.13'
Religious Attendance			.03	.03	.04
Tract Ethnicity Ukrainian			-.28'	-.30'	-.27'
Sex				-.04	-.04
Education				-.15'	-.13'
Wifeworks				-.04	-.06
House Type				-.03	-.03
Total Persons in Household					-.15'
Tract Income					.13'
Social Mix					-.16'
r^2 =	.12	.19	.26	.28	.32

'Significant at .05

Table 6.13 Standard Structural Equations for Chat with Neighbors

Small Town, Leduc (n = 257)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Age	.03	.18[1]	.20[1]	.21[1]	.22[1]
Marital Status	-.15[1]	-.09	-.08	-.06	-.06
Occupation/Social Class	-.05	-.07	-.08	-.09	-.09
Family Income	.01	.03	.02	-.02	-.00
Ethnicity British		-.02	-.03	-.04	-.04
Ethnicity German		-.01	-.02	-.02	-.02
Tenure		.17[1]	.17[1]	.18[1]	.18[1]
Shelter Cost		.13[1]	.16[1]	.16[1]	.16[1]
Age of Neighborhood		-.09[1]	-.10[1]	-.10[1]	-.08
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.10[1]	-.09[1]	-.09[1]	-.09[1]
Friendly - Unfriendly		.16[1]	.16[1]	.14[1]	.14[1]
Religious Attendance			-.06	-.07	-.07
Tract Ethnicity British			.13[1]	.13[1]	.13[1]
Sex				-.08	-.09[1]
Education				.08	.09
Wifeworks				-.07	-.07
House Type				.03	.03
Total Persons in Household					.00
Length of Residence					.01
Tract 65 and Over					-.04
Social Mix					-.06
r^2 =	.02	.10	.12	.13	.14

[1] Significant at .05

Table 6.14 Standard Structural Equations for Social Evening with Relatives

Downtown, Edmonton (n = 120)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Marital Status	-.02	-.01	-.01	-.05	-.05
Occupation/Social Class	-.10	-.13	-.14	.02	.03
Income	-.06	-.04	-.03	-.10	-.07
Ethnicity British		-.17'	-.19'	-.21'	-.20'
Ethnicity German		-.10	-.10	-.11	-.10
House Type		.07	.08	.13	.10
Shelter Cost		.02	-.00	.01	.07
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.17'	-.18'	-.16'	-.17'
Easy to get around - Hard		.12	.11	.13'	.12
Religious Attendance			-.14'	-.15'	-.15'
Tract Ethnicity German			.06	.05	.11
Sex				-.13'	-.11
Education				.27'	.31'
Wifeworks				.13	.14
Total Persons in Household					-.04
Length of Residence					.11
Tract 65 and Over					.08
Tract Income					-.13
Social Mix					.00
r^2 =	.01	.09	.11	.20	.23

'Significant at .05

Table 6.15 Standard Structural Equations for Social Evening with Relatives

Suburbs, Edmonton (n = 215)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Family Status	.13'	.18'	.22'	.23'	.21'
Occupation/Social Class	-.11	-.08	-.04	-.02	-.02
Income	-.08	-.08	-.08	-.08	-.07
Ethnicity British		.22'	.18'	.19'	.18'
Ethnicity German		.18'	.17'	.17'	.18'
Ethnicity Ukrainian		.08	.13'	.13'	.13'
Tenure		.09	.09	.11'	.11
Shelter Cost		.00	-.02	-.02	-.04
Quality of Life Satisfaction		.05	.04	.04	.02
Rural - Big City		-.17'	-.16'	-.15'	-.16'
Religious Attendance			-.09	-.09	-.08
Tract Ethnicity German			.02	.02	.04
Tract Ethnicity Ukrainian			-.19'	-.21'	-.23'
Sex				-.04	-.04
Education				-.03	-.02
Wifeworks				.08	.06
Length of Residence					-.02
Tract Youth					.12'
Social Mix					-.05
r^2 =	.03	.11	.15	.16	.17

'Significant at .05

Table 6.16 Standard Structural Equations for Social Evening with Relatives

Small Town, Leduc (n = 247)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Marital Status	-.00	-.00	-.01	-.03	-.07
Occupation/Social Class	-.09	-.10'	-.11'	-.06	-.07
Family Income	-.08	-.15'	-.14'	-.17'	-.22'
Ethnicity British		.04	.05	.05	.04
Ethnicity Ukrainian		-.09	-.09	-.09'	-.10'
Shelter Cost		.08	.10'	.10'	.08
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.01	-.04	-.05	-.03
Rural - Big City		-.11'	-.12'	-.12'	-.13'
Religious Attendance			.11'	.11'	.11'
Tract Ethnicity British			.10'	.11'	.09'
Sex				-.00	-.01
Education				.04	.05
Wifeworks				.09	.11'
House Type				.08	.07
Total Persons in Household					.11'
Length of Residence					-.03
Social Mix					.02
r^2 =	.01	.04	.05	.07	.07

'Significant at .05

Table 6.17 Standard Structural Equations for Social Evening with Friends

Downtown, Edmonton (n = 122)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Age	.35[1]	.41[1]	.43[1]	.44[1]	.45[1]
Occupation/Social Class	.15[1]	.14[1]	.12[1]	.18[1]	.18[1]
Income	-.06	-.03	-.04	-.05	-.04
Ethnicity British		.13[1]	.16[1]	.14[1]	.14[1]
Ethnicity German		.06	.08	.10	.08
House Type		-.00	-.02	-.07	-.12
Shelter Cost		-.11	-.10	-.09	-.11
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.06	-.04	-.04	-.05
Friendly - Unfriendly		.18[1]	.22[1]	.23[1]	.22[1]
Religious Attendance			.00	-.01	-.02
Tract Ethnicity British			-.23[1]	-.22[1]	-.20[1]
Tract Ethnicity German			.19[1]	.18[1]	.17[1]
Sex				.06	.06
Education				-.01	.01
Wifeworks				.15[1]	.14[1]
Total Persons in Household					.09
Social Mix					.05
r^2 =	.18	.25	.30	.32	.33

[1] Significant at .05

Table 6.18 Standard Structural Equations for Social Evening with Friends

Suburbs, Edmonton (n = 215)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Age	.22[1]	.20[1]	.20[1]	.18[1]	.18[1]
Marital Status	.08	.09	.11[1]	.14[1]	.09
Occupation/Social Class	.00	.01	.03	-.03	-.01
Income	.14[1]	.17[1]	.17[1]	.17[1]	.19[1]
Ethnicity British		-.02	-.04	-.04	-.07
Ethnicity Ukrainian		-.07	-.03	-.04	-.06
Shelter Cost		.00	-.01	.01	-.01
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.15[1]	-.15[1]	-.16[1]	-.16[1]
Nothing to do - Lots		.13[1]	.13[1]	.14[1]	.13[1]
Religious Attendance			-.10[1]	-.10[1]	-.09
Tract Ethnicity Ukrainian			-.12[1]	-.14[1]	-.17[1]
Sex				.01	-.01
Education				-.13[1]	-.12[1]
Wifeworks				-.08	-.06
House Type				-.03	-.05
Total Persons in Household					.16[1]
Tract Youth					-.07
Social Mix					-.10[1]
r^2 =	.07	.10	.13	.14	.17

[1] Significant at .05

Table 6.19 Standard Structural Equations for Social Evening with Friends

Small Town, Leduc (n = 240)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Age	.28[1]	.29[1]	.30[1]	.26[1]	.25[1]
Marital Status	.06	.07	.08	.10[1]	.18[1]
Occupation/Social Class	-.05	-.03	-.03	-.13[1]	-.13[1]
Emptynest	-.08	-.06	-.11[1]	-.09[1]	-.13[1]
Family Income	-.13[1]	-.16[1]	-.14[1]	-.08	-.04
Ethnicity British		-.01	-.03	-.01	-.01
Ethnicity German		-.03	-.03	-.03	-.03
Shelter Cost		.05	.02	.01	.04
Population Density		-.05	-.18[1]	-.18[1]	-.19[1]
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.12[1]	-.13[1]	-.15[1]	-.17[1]
Good Place for Children - Poor		-.15[1]	-.14[1]	-.16[1]	-.16[1]
Religious Attendance			.02	.01	.02
Tract Ethnicity Ukrainian			-.24[1]	-.25[1]	-.23[1]
Sex				.04	.06
Education				-.13[1]	-.14[1]
Wifeworks				-.16[1]	-.19[1]
House Type				.01	.01
Total Persons in Household					-.21[1]
Length of Residence					.03
Social Mix					.02
r^2 =	.10	.14	.18	.21	.24

[1] Significant at .05

Table 6.20 Standard Structural Equations for Social Evening with Friends

Marrieds, Small Town, Leduc (n = 197)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Age	.19[1]	.22[1]	.21[1]	.16[1]	.16[1]
Occupation/Social Class	-.08	-.07	-.06	-.19[1]	-.19[1]
Emptynest	-.10	-.08	-.13[1]	-.11[1]	-.15[1]
Family Income	-.12[1]	-.13[1]	-.11[1]	-.06	-.01
Ethnicity British		-.00	-.01	.01	.02
Ethnicity German		-.03	-.03	-.03	-.03
Shelter Cost		.04	.01	-.01	.05
Population Density		-.05	-.18[1]	-.15[1]	-.18[1]
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.11[1]	-.09	-.13[1]	-.16[1]
Good Place for Children - Poor		-.13[1]	-.13[1]	-.16[1]	-.15[1]
Religious Attendance			.01	-.01	.02
Tract Ethnicity Ukrainian			-.26[1]	-.25[1]	-.22[1]
Sex				-.02	-.01
Education				-.13[1]	-.14[1]
Wifeworks				-.23[1]	-.27[1]
House Type				.06	.04
Total Persons in Household					-.21[1]
Length of Residence					.08
Social Mix					.02
r^2 =	.06	.09	.14	.19	.22

[1] Significant at .05

Table 6.21 Standard Structural Equations for Social Evening with Friends

Non-Marrieds, Small Town, Leduc (n = 43)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Age	.48[1]	.46[1]	.54[1]	.58[1]	.58[1]
Occupation/Social Class	.08	.12	.10	.04	.18
Family Income	-.17	-.24[1]	-.19	-.04	-.07
Ethnicity British		-.06	-.14	-.27	-.33[1]
Ethnicity German		-.03	-.08	-.12	-.18
Shelter Cost		.11	.13	.12	.10
Population Density		-.04	-.20	-.30	-.29
Quality of Life Satisfaction		-.08	-.20	-.26	-.29[1]
Good Place for Children - Poor		-.22[1]	-.17	-.13	-.15[1]
Religious Attendance			-.00	-.05	-.04
Tract Ethnicity Ukrainian			-.32[1]	-.44[1]	-.39[1]
Sex				.21	.25
Education				-.14	-.11
House Type				-.14	-.16
Total Persons in Household					-.08
Length of Residence					-.17
Social Mix					.19
r^2 =	.30	.38	.42	.49	.53

[1] Significant at .05

APPENDIX F

PROBLEMS WITH COLLINEARITY IN MULTIPLE REGRESSION

During these intial regressions, another problem of collinearity was recognized. Gordon (1968:598) noted that if a particular construct, A, was represented in a multiple regression equation by a few variables and another construct, B, by a large number of variables, the predictive value of the B variables would be spread over several regression coefficients and that of A over a few. Thus B variables would appear to be less strongly related to the dependent variable than A variables.

Gordon demonstrated (1968:599-600) that this result held even when the B variables had high zero-order correlations with the dependent variable. The use of unequal numbers of variables representing two different constructs in the same multiple regression equation may result in the larger number of variables displaying low, non-significant regression coefficients. The smaller number of variables representing concept A displayed higher, significant regression coefficients even when their zero-order coefficients were lower.

In the present case, inflated/deflated regression coefficients were observed in the initial regressions among two sets of variables. One set of eight satisfaction variables designed to measure quality of life satisfaction and one set of twelve variables designed to contribute to a semantic differential on urban-rural values. Gordon (1968) offerred no arbitrary solution to this collinearity problem. The solutions adopted were those discussed above (Nie et al,1975:34).

With the exception of one variable, the satisfaction variables were added together to form a single quality of life measure. The one variable, overall job satisfaction, was discarded due to selective response rates. The semantic differential set of variables was another problem. One solution was to construct composite indices using factor analysis (Nie et al,1975:487-488). The resultant scales when entered into subsequent regression failed to behave predictably. Other attempts were made to construct a single variable by adding the set of variables or parts of the set together. When these additions were entered into regression equations, they failed to behave as predicted. Finally, individual variables from the set based on prediction and strength were used in each separate regression.

APPENDIX G

EDMONTON AREA STUDY
QUESTIONNAIRE

1977

	PLEASE LEAV BLANK
1. Interviewers Name ____________________	1 _ _ _
2. Interview I.D. No. ____________	
3. Electoral District ____________	_ _
4. Enumeration Area ____________	_ _ _
5. Your Interview No. ____________	
6. Date ____________ Time of Interview ________	
7. Length of Interview ____________ Minutes.	
8. Address Label	
9. Appointment Time ____________	
10. No Interview ____________________	

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

First a few questions about this household.

1. Including yourself, how many persons altogether live here, related to you or not?

   TOTAL PERSONS ______________ __ __

2. Now a list of the members of this household. To make it easier, I'm going to ask for the first name of each member.

FIRST NAME	SEX	AGE	RELATIONSHIP TO RESPONDENT
1) ____			Respondent
2) ____			
3) ____			
4) ____			
5) ____			
6) ____			
7) ____			
8) ____			
9) ____			
10)			

ASK ONLY IF R HAS CHILDREN IN SCHOOL OTHERWISE GO TO Q 5.

3. Do your children go to public, separate or private schools?

   Public 1 Separate 2 Private 3 Mixed 4 __

4. (CARD A) Overall how satisfied are you with the quality of the education provided for your child(ren)?

Very Dissatisfied				Very Satisfied			DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

__

PLEASE LEAV
BLANK

5. What is the highest grade in elementary school or high school that you finished?

YOU ____________________ __ __

YOUR SPOUSE ____________ __ __

IF R OR SPOUSE FINISHED 12th OR 13th GRADE, ASK THIS QUESTION.

6. How many years of post secondary education do you have?

YOU ____________________ __ __

YOUR SPOUSE ____________ __ __

I would like to get some background information about you.

7. What is your religious preference?

YOU ________________________________ __

YOUR SPOUSE __________________________ __

8. Would you call yourself a ______________ (STATED PREFERENCE)
(Adjective)

Adjective

Strong 1

Not very strong 2

Somewhat strong 3
(VOLUNTEERED)

Not applicable 4

__

PLEASE LEAV
BLANK

9. How often do you attend religious services? (RECORD ONLY)

Response	
Never	0
Less than once a year	1
About once a year	2
Several times a year	3
About once a month	4
2 - 3 times a month	5
Nearly every week	6
Several times a week	7

—

10. From what country did your father's ancestors come?

____

— —

11. Do you speak a second language?

Yes _____
No _____ Which one? ______________________

— —

Now I have some questions about your living accomodations.

12. How long have you lived in this residence?

Years or months ______________________

— —

13. Do you own this house/apartment or pay rent?

Response	
Owns	1
Pays rent	2
Neither owns nor rents	3

—

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

14. How many rooms do you have here, not counting hallways and bathrooms?

Number of rooms ____________

__ __

15. Would you say that this home has enough space so you can do the things you want to do?

Yes ____________ No ______________

__

16. What do you think about the condition of this house/apartment?

Response

Needs no repairs 1
Needs minor repairs 2
Needs major repairs 3
DK 8
NA 9

__

17. (CARD A) How satisfied are you with this house/apartment?

Very Dissatisfied						Very Satisfied	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

__

ASK Q 18 TO Q 21 ONLY IF R RENTS.

18. (CARD B) About how much rent do you pay a month, including utilities?

2 __ __ __

Response

under 100 01
100 - 199 02
200 - 299 03
300 - 399 04
400 - 499 05
500 - 599 06
600 - 699 07
700 - 799 08
800 - 899 09
900 - 999 10
1000 + ... 11
DK 12
NA 13

__ __

PLEASE LEAV
BLANK

19. During the last two years, have you considered buying a home?

Response

Yes 1
No 2
NA (GO TO Q. 21) 3

20. Have you actually looked for a home?

Response

Yes 1   No 2

21. Why have you not purchased a home of your own? Please rank in order of importance. UP TO 5 RESPONSES.

____

____

____

____

____

ASK ONLY IF R OWNS.

22. (CARD B) Think of the cost of this house/apartment -- such as mortage payments, the maintenance costs, property taxes, and utilities. Which of the categories best describes how much you pay per month?

Response

under 100	01	700 - 799	08
100 - 199	02	800 - 899	09
200 - 299	03	900 - 999	10
300 - 399	04	1000 +	11
400 - 499	05	DK	12
500 - 599	06	NA	13
600 - 699	07		

Now I have some questions about this immediate neighbourhood, that is the ten or fifteen homes nearest to yours/or the apartments in this building and the area around this building.

PLEASE LEAV BLANK

23. To what extent are any of the following, problems in this neighbourhood?

	Major Problem	Minor Problem	Not a Problem	
Noisy neighbours	1	2	3	___
Vandalism	1	2	3	___
Abandoned houses	1	2	3	___
Noisy vehicles	1	2	3	___
Children and teenagers who misbehave	1	2	3	___
Poorly kept yards	1	2	3	___
Cats and dogs running loose	1	2	3	___
Traffic	1	2	3	___
Other (Specify)	1	2	3	___

____

24. (CARD A) All things considered, how satisfied are you with this neighbourhood as a place to live? Which number comes closest to how satisfied you feel?

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	___

IF R HAS A FAMILY ASK Q. 25; OTHERWISE GO TO Q. 26.

25. Do you feel there are sufficient places for your child(ren) to play in this neighbourhood? ___

Yes _____

No _____

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

26. (CARD A) How satisfied are you with your personal safety in this neighbourhood?

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

—

Now I'd like to ask about your neighbours.

27. How many of the adults in this neighbourhood would you know by name if you met them on the street?

Response	
All of them	1
Almost all	2
More than half	3
About half	4
Less than half	5
Almost none	6
None	7

—

28. How often do you get together with any of these neighbours just for a chat?

Response	
Daily or almost every day	1
1 - 3 times a week	2
1 - 3 times a month	3
Less than once a month	4
Never	5

—

29. How often do you spend a social evening with friends, either in your home or their home, who live outside the neighbourhood?

Response			
Daily or almost every day	1	Never	5
1 - 3 times a week	2	Don't know ...	8
1 - 3 times a month	3	No answer	9
Less than once a month	4		

—

PLEASE LEAV
BLANK

30. How often do you spend a social evening with relatives?

Response	
Daily or almost every day	1
1 - 3 times a week	2
1 - 3 times a month	3
Less than once a month	4
Never	5
No answer	9

31. How often do you go out for entertainment, like movies, night clubs, sports events, plays, concerts, etc.?

Response	
Daily or almost every day	1
1 - 3 times a week	2
1 - 3 times a month	3
Less than once a month	4
Never	5
DK	8
NA	9

32. (CARD A) All things considered, how satisfied are you with the recreational facilities available to you in Edmonton?

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Now I have a few questions about how satisfied you are with different parts of your life.

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

33. (CARD A) For each area of life I am going to name, tell me the number that shows how much satisfaction you get from that area.

A. Your non-working activities -- hobbies and so on.

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

B. Your family life.

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

C. Your health and physical condition.

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

D. The amount of time you have for doing things you want to do.

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

E. Your friendships.

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

F. Your standard of living -- the things you have -- housing, car, furniture, recreation, and the like.

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

G. All in all how satisfied with life are you these days?

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

PLEASE LEAVE
BLANK

34. In general, do you find life exciting, pretty routine, or dull?

Exciting	1
Routine	4
Dull	7
No opinion	8
No answer	9

35. How often do you participate in a vigorous exercise program?

Never	1
Seldom	2
Weekly	3
More frequently	4
No answer	9

36. About how much beer, wine or liquor do you drink per week?

Response	
None	1
1 - 7 drinks	2
8 - 15 drinks	3
16 or more drinks	4
Don't know	8
No answer	9

37. About how many cigarettes do you smoke per day?

Response			
None	1	Don't know	8
1 - 9	2	No answer	9
10 or more	3		

(NOTE OTHER SMOKING HABITS)

PLEASE LEAV
BLANK

38. How often do you wear a seatbelt when you drive?

Always .... 1 Never 3
Occasionally ..... 2 NA 9

39. How many cups of coffee and/or tea per day do you drink?

Number ______________

A few moments ago we talked about your personal safety. Now we would like to have your opinions about the nature of police and community relations.

40. How good do you think relations are between the police and the people in this city?

Very good 1
Fairly good 2
Neither good nor bad 3
Not very good 4
Not good at all 5

41. Were you ever picked up and charged by the police, for any reason other than a traffic offense?

Yes ...... 1 No ...... 2 No answer 8

42. In general, do you think the courts in this country deal too harshly or not harshly enough with criminals?

Too harshly 1
Not harshly enough 2
About right (VOLUNTEERED).. 3
DK 8
No answer 9

PLEASE LEAV
BLANK

43. Everything considered, would you say that, in general, you approve or disapprove of wiretapping?

Approve	1	No opinion	8
Disapprove	2	No answer	9

44. Do you favor or oppose the death penalty for persons convicted of murder?

Favor	1	Don't know	8
Oppose	2	No answer	9

45. Would you favor or oppose a law which would require a person to obtain a police permit before he or she could buy any gun or rifle?

Favor	1	Don't know	8
Oppose	2	No answer	9

46. When a policeman arrests a person, which of the following must he do before questionning the person?

A. Is he required to read the person his rights?

Yes	1	DK	8
No	2	NA	9

B. Is he required to tell the person he has a right to remain silent?

Yes	1	DK	8
No	2	NA	9

C. Is he required to tell the person he has the right to a lawyer?

Yes	1	DK	8
No	2	NA	9

PLEASE LEAVI
BLANK

47. Would you say there has been any change in violent crime here in Edmonton in the past five years?

Alot more 1
Quite a bit more 2
A little bit more ... 3
A little bit less ... 4
Quite a bit less 5
Alot less 6
DK 8
No answer 9

48. During the last year did anyone illegally enter into your house/apartment?

Yes .... 1 No .... 2 NA 9

49. During the last year, did anyone take something directly from you by using force?

Yes .... 1 No .... 2 NA 9

50. What precautions have you taken to safeguard your house against burglarly? (CIRCLE THE CORRECT RESPONSE)

A. Do you lock your doors?

Yes .... 1 No .... 2 NA 9

B. Are there special locks or bars or anything else like that on your windows?

Yes .... 1 No .... 2 NA 9

C. Is there a burglar alarm?

Yes .... 1 No .... 2 NA 9

D. Do you have an insurance policy that protects your house/apartment and belongings against theft?

Yes .... 1 No .... 2 NA 9

PLEASE LEAVI
BLANK

Now some questions about employment.

51. Last week were you working full time, part time, going to school, keeping house, or what?

(CIRCLE ONE CODE ONLY IF MORE ~~THAN~~ ONE RESPONSE, GIVE PREFERENCE TO SMALLEST CODE THAT APPLIES.)

Response	
Working full time	1
Working part time	2
With a job, but not at work because of temporary illness, vacation, strike	3
Unemployed, laid off, looking for work	4
Retired	5
In school	6
Keeping house	7
Other (specify)	8

Other ____

IF APPROPRIATE (1-4 ABOVE).

52. What kind of work (do/did) you normally do?

Occupation: ____________________________________

53. What kind of place (do/did) you work for?

Industry: ______________________________________

53A. Where (Location)? ______________________________

ASK ONLY IF R IS MARRIED OR LIVING IN A COMMON-LAW-RELATIONSHIP; OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q. 57.

PLEASE LEAVI
BLANK

54. Last week was your spouse working full time?

Response	
Working full time	1
Working part time	2
With a job, but not at work because of temporary illness, vacation, strike	3
Unemployed, laid off, looking for work	4
Retired	5
In school	6
Keeping house	7
Other (specify)	8
Not applicable	0

Other ______________________________ _

55. What kind of work does your spouse do?

Occupation: ______________________________ _ _

3 _ _ _

56. What kind of place (does/did) (he/she) work for?

Industry: ______________________________ _ _

56A. Where (Location)? ______________________________ _ _

IF NOT APPROPRIATE (NOT WORKING) GO TO Q. 60.

PLEASE LEAV
BLANK

57. (CARD A) For each area of your job I'm going to name, tell me the number that shows how much satisfaction you get from that area.

A. The recognition you get from your job.

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied DK NA IA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

B. Your control over the pace and quality of your work.

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied DK NA IA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

C. The extent to which you can use your skills.

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied DK NA IA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

D. The feeling of accomplishment for the work you are doing.

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied DK NA IA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

E. The physical conditions under which you work, for example lighting, temperature, dust free, etc.

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied DK NA IA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

F. The opportunity for advancement.

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied DK NA IA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

G. The amount of pay.

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied DK NA IA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

H. The degree of security.

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied DK NA IA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

PLEASE LEAVI
BLANK

58. (CARD A) All things considered, how satisfied are you with your job? (Which number comes closest to how satisfied or dissatisfied you feel?)

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

—

59. What is the possibility of losing your job during the coming 12 months?

Very Likely	1
Somewhat likely	2
Not very likely	3
Not at all likely	4
Don't know	8

—

60. Generally, do you approve or disapprove of a married woman working if she has a husband capable of supporting her?

Approve	1
Disapprove	2
Don't know	3
No answer	4

—

ASK Q'S 61 AND 62 ONLY IF R IS CURRENTLY MARRIED OR LIVING IN A COMMON-LAW-RELATIONSHIP: OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q. 63.

PLEASE LEAV
BLANK

61. (CARD C) Please use the numbers on the card to tell me how you and your spouse share the following tasks:

A. Earning the family income.

Husband Entirely	Husband More	Share Equally	Wife More	Wife Entirely	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

B. Housekeeping.

Husband Entirely	Husband More	Share Equally	Wife More	Wife Entirely	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

C. Keeping in touch with relatives.

Husband Entirely	Husband More	Share Equally	Wife More	Wife Entirely	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

D. Organizing family recreation.

Husband Entirely	Husband More	Share Equally	Wife More	Wife Entirely	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

E. Taking care of preschool children. (younger than 5)

Husband Entirely	Husband More	Share Equally	Wife More	Wife Entirely	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

F. Teaching, helping, and disciplining girls, aged 6 - 12.

Husband Entirely	Husband More	Share Equally	Wife More	Wife Entirely	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

G. Teaching, helping, and disciplining boys, aged 6 - 12.

Husband Entirely	Husband More	Share Equally	Wife More	Wife Entirely	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

62. (CARD D) Please use the numbers on the card to tell me how often you and your spouse have disagreed about each of the following activities.

A. Housekeeping.

Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Very Frequently	NA
1	2	3	4	5	9

___

B. Earning money.

Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Very Frequently	NA
1	2	3	4	5	9

___

C. Visiting or writing relatives.

Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Very Frequently	NA
1	2	3	4	5	9

___

D. Recreation.

Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Very Frequently	NA
1	2	3	4	5	9

___

E. Confiding with each other about problems.

Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Very Frequently	NA
1	2	3	4	5	9

___

F. Care of pre-school children.

Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Very Frequently	NA
1	2	3	4	5	9

___

(THIS QUESTION CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

Q. 62 Continued.

G. Teaching and disciplining girls, age 6 - 12.

Never	Seldom	Some-times	Fre-quently	Very Fre-quently	NA
1	2	3	4	5	9

___

H. Teaching and disciplining boys, age 6 - 12.

Never	Seldom	Some-times	Fre-quently	Very Fre-quently	NA
1	2	3	4	5	9

___

63. Are you in contact with any of your relatives?

Yes ____________________

No (GO TO Q. 65) __________

___

64. In the past two years or so, have you received any of the following kinds of help from your RELATIVES. Yes or No?

	YES	NO	NA	IA
A. Advice on a decision you had to make	1	2	9	0
B. Help on special occasions, such as childbirth, sickness	1	2	9	0
C. Help in caring for your children, such as babysitting	1	2	9	0
D. Financial assistance, such as money or a loan	1	2	9	0
E. Gifts, other than birthdays, Christmas, etc.	1	2	9	0
F. Home repairs, moving, odd jobs, etc.	1	2	9	0
G. Finding a job	1	2	9	0

PLEASE LEAVI
BLANK

65. Finally, we would like to know something about the groups and organizations to which you belong. Could you name them? (PROBE)

1. ____________________ —
2. ____________________ —
3. ____________________ —
4. ____________________ —
5. ____________________ —

Now we would like to ask you some questions about family size.

66. What do you think is the ideal number of children for a family to have?

Number ____________ —

IF APPLICABLE.

67. How many children have you ever had? Please count all that were born alive at any time (including any you had from a previous relationship.)

Number ____________ —

68. Do you expect to have any (more) children?

Response

Yes (ASK Q. 68) 1
No (GO TO Q. 69) 2
Uncertain (GO TO Q. 69) 3
Not asked, inappropriate 4
No answer .... 9 —

69. How many (more)?

Number ____________ —

PLEASE LEAVI BLANK

70. (CARD E) Would you approve or disapprove of a married couple not bearing or rearing children?

Strongly Disapprove					Strongly Approve		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

71. Do you think birth control information should be available to teenagers who want it?

Response	
Should be available	1
Should not be available	2
Depends on the age/grade .... (VOLUNTEERED)	3
No opinion	8
No answer	9

72. Please tell me whether or not you think it should be possible for a pregnant woman to obtain a legal abortion if ... READ EACH STATEMENT, AND CIRCLE ONE CODE FOR EACH.

	YES	NO	DK	NA
A. there is a strong chance of serious defects in the baby?	1	2	8	9
B. she is married and does not want any more children?	1	2	8	9
C. the woman's own health is seriously endangered by the pregnancy?	1	2	8	9
D. the family has a very low income and cannot afford any more children? ...	1	2	8	9
E. she became pregnant as a result of rape?	1	2	8	9
F. she is not married and does not want to marry the father?	1	2	8	9

PLEASE LEAV
BLANK

73. Are you against sex education in the schools?

Response	
For	1
Against	2
Depends on the age/grade	3 (VOLUNTEERED)
Don't know	8
No answer	9

Now some questions about finances.

74. Would you say that you (and your family) are better off or worse off financially than you were a year ago?

Response	
Better now	1
Same	2
Worse	3
Don't know	8

75. Now looking ahead -- do you think that a year from now you (and your family) will be better off financially, or worse off, or just about the same as now?

Response	
Will be better off	1
Same	2
Will be worse off	3
Don't know	8

76. (CARD F) Would you please tell me the letter on this card which best represents your total family income for 1976, before taxes?

PLEASE LEAVI
BLANK

Response

A.	Under $2,000	01
B.	$2,000 - $2,999	02
C.	$3,000 - $3,999	03
D.	$4,000 - $4,999	04
E.	$5,000 - $5,999	05
F.	$6,000 - $6,999	06
G.	$7,000 - $7,999	07
H.	$8,000 - $9,999	08
I.	$10,000 - $11,999	09
J.	$12,000 - $14,999	10
K.	$15,000 - $17,499	11
L.	$17,500 - $19,999	12
M.	$20,000 - $22,499	13
N.	$22,500 - $24,999	14
O.	$25,000 - $29,999	15
P.	$30,000 - $34,999	16
Q.	$35,000 and over	17
	Don't know	88
	No answer	99

— —

77. (REFER R TO RESPONSE SHEET) Here is a sheet which we would like you to fill out to describe Edmonton as it appears to you. For example, if you think Edmonton is especially attractive, please put an "X" in the box next to the word "attractive". If you think it is especially unattractive, please put an "X" next to "unattractive", and if you think it is somewhere in between, please put an "X" in the box where you think it belongs.

ATTRACTIVE	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	UNATTRACTIVE
UNFRIENDLY PEOPLE	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	FRIENDLY PEOPLE
CROWDED	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	UNCROWDED
VERY GOOD PLACE TO LIVE	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	VERY POOR PLACE TO LIVE
PLEASANT	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	UNPLEASANT
BIG CITY	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	RURAL
NOTHING TO DO	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	LOTS OF THINGS TO DO
HARD TO GET AROUND IN	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	EASY TO GET AROUND IN
GOOD PLACE TO RAISE CHILDREN	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	BAD PLACE TO RAISE CHILDREN
SAFE	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	UNSAFE
POOR CLIMATE	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	GOOD CLIMATE
CLEAN AIR	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	DIRTY AIR

Interview Number ____________

PLEASE LEAVI
BLANK

Now before I go just a few questions about a topic that has recently been in the news.

78. What have you thought of the government's swine flu vaccination program?

____

____

79. Were you in favour of the vaccination program or opposed to the program when it first began?

Favoured	1	Don't know, no answer	9
Opposed	2	Other (Record)	____________

____ —

80. As you know the program has been suspended. Would you be in favour of the government continuing the program?

Yes	1	Don't know, no answer	9
No	2	Other (Record)	____________

____ —

81. Suppose that sometime in the future we are told that there is the possibility of another swine flu epidemic. If this possibility arises, should the government sponsor another vaccination program?

Yes	1	Don't know, no answer	9
No	2	Other (Record)	____________

____ —

82. Suppose that sometime in the future we are told that there is the possibility of an epidemic other than swine flu. If this possibility arises, should the government sponsor a vaccination program?

Yes	1	Don't know, no answer	9
No	2	Other (Record)	____________

____ —

83. Did you have a swine flu shot?

Yes ..... 1 No ..... 2 No answer ..... 9 —

TO BE COMPLETED BY INTERVIEWER

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

1. Housing type:

Single House	1
Semi-detached	2
Duplex	3
Row House	4
Apartment or Multiple Dwelling	5
House attached to a Non-residential structure	6
Mobile Home	7
Other (specify)	8

_

2. Respondents Cooperation:

Cooperative	1
Indifferent	2
Uncooperative	3

_

3. Quality of Interview:

High Quality	1
Adequate	2
Questionable	3

_

4. Comments of Interviewer:

____

____

____

____

____

____

ATTRACTIVE	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	UNATTRACTIVE
UNFRIENDLY PEOPLE	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	FRIENDLY PEOPLE
CROWDED	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	UNCROWDED
VERY GOOD PLACE TO LIVE	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	VERY POOR PLACE TO LIVE
PLEASANT	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	UNPLEASANT
BIG CITY	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	RURAL
NOTHING TO DO	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	LOTS OF THINGS TO DO
HARD TO GET AROUND IN	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	EASY TO GET AROUND IN
GOOD PLACE TO RAISE CHILDREN	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	BAD PLACE TO RAISE CHILDREN
SAFE	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	UNSAFE
POOR CLIMATE	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	GOOD CLIMATE
CLEAN AIR	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	DIRTY AIR

LEDUC AREA STUDY
QUESTIONNAIRE

1977

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

_ _ _ _

_ _ _

1. Interviewers Name ______________________________

2. Interview I.D. No. ______________

3. Electoral District ______________

4. Enumeration Area ______________

5. Your Interview No. ______________

6. Date ______________ Time of Interview ______________

7. Length of Interview ______________ Minutes.

8. Address Label

9. Appointment Time ______________

10. No Interview ______________________________

____

____

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

"First a few questions about this household."

1. Including yourself, how many persons altogether live here, related to you or not?

TOTAL PERSONS ______________

2. Now a list of the members of this household. To make it easier, I'm going to ask for the first name of each member.

FIRST NAME	SEX	AGE	RELATIONSHIP TO RESPONDENT
1)			Respondent
2)			
3)			
4)			
5)			
6)			
7)			
8)			
9)			
10)			

3. What is your marital status?

Married 1 Widowed 2 Divorced 3 Separated 4

Living together 5 Single 6

ASK ONLY IF R HAS CHILDREN OTHERWISE GO TO Q 5

4. (Card G) How happy are you with the quality of education provided for your child(ren)?

Very Unhappy					Very Happy		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

5. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

YOU ____________________

YOUR SPOUSE ____________________

"I would like to get some background information about you."

6. What is your religious preference? (NOT PROTESTANT)

YOU ____________

YOUR SPOUSE ____________

7. Would you call yourself a ____________ (STATED PREFERENCE)
(Adjective)

Adjective

Strong	1
Not very strong	2
Not strong at all	3
Not applicable	4

8. How often do you attend religious services? (RECORD ONLY)

Response

Never	0
Less than once a year	1
About once a year	2
Several times a year	3
About once a month	4
2 - 3 times a month	5
Nearly every week	6
Several times a week	7

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

9. From what country did your father's ancestors come?

____

10. Do you speak a second language?

Yes ______

No ______ Which one? ____________

"Now I have some questions about your living accomodations."

11. How long have you lived in this residence?

months ____________________

12. How long have you lived in Leduc?

months ____________________

IF BORN HERE GO TO Q 15

13. Can you tell me the reason why you moved here?

Liked place 1 Buy house 2 Get job 3

Job transfer 4 Near relatives 5

Near friends 6 Other __________________

14. (CARD G) How happy are you with that move?

Very Unhappy						Very happy	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

15. Would you recommend Leduc as a good place to raise children?

Yes 1 No 2 Depends 3 DK 8 NA 9

16. Would you like to move somewhere else?

Yes 1 No 2 DK 8 NA 9

17. IF YES: Where would you like to live?

name of place ________________________

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

18. How likely is it that you will move in the next twelve months?

Very likely	Likely	Uncertain	Unlikely	Very unlikely
1	2	3	4	5

19. Do you own this house/apartment or pay rent?

Response	
Owns	1
Pays Rent	2
Neither owns nor rents	3

20. How many rooms do you have here, not counting hallways and bathrooms?

Number of rooms ___________

21. Would you say that this home has enough space so you can do the things you want to do?

Yes _____________ No __________

22. To what extent are any of the following, problems in your house or apartment?

	Major Problem	Minor Problem	Not a Problem
Family interaction	1	2	3
Privacy	1	2	3
Crowding	1	2	3
State of Repair	1	2	3
Exterior features of unit..	1	2	3
Location re availability of services	1	2	3

PLEASE LEAVE
BLANK

23. What do you think about the condition of this house/apartment?

Response

Needs no repairs 1

Needs minor repairs 2

Needs major repairs.................3

DK 8

NA 9

24. (CARD A) How satisfied are you with this house/apartment?

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

ASK Q.25 TO Q.27 ONLY IF R RENTS

25. (CARD B) About how much rent do you pay a month, including utilities?

Response

Under 100 01

100 - 199 02

200 - 299 03

300 - 399 04

400 - 499 05

500 - 599 06

600 - 699 07

700 - 799 08

800 - 899 09

900 - 999 10

1000+ 11

DK 12

NA 13

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

26. During the last two years, have you considered buying a home?

Response

Yes 1

No 2

NA 3

27. What reason made you decide against it?

28. ASK ONLY IF R OWNS

(CARD B) Think of the cost of this house/apartment -- such as mortgage payments, the maintenance costs, property taxes, and utilities. Which of the categories best describes how much you pay per month?

Response

Under 100 01

100 - 199 02

200 - 299 03

300 - 399 04

400 - 499 05

500 - 599 06

600 - 699 07

700 - 799 08

800 - 899 09

900 - 999 10

1000 + ... 11

DK 12

NA 13

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

"Now I have some questions about this immediate neighbourhood, that is the ten or fifteen homes nearest to yours/or the apartments in this building and the area around this building"

29. To what extent are any of the following, problems in this neighbourhood?

	Major Problem	Minor Problem	Not a Problem	
Noisy neighbours	1	2	3	____
Vandalism	1	2	3	____
Abandoned houses	1	2	3	____
Noisy vehicles	1	2	3	____
Children and teenagers who misbehave	1	2	3	____
Poorly kept yards	1	2	3	____
Cats and dogs running loose..	1	2	3	____
Traffic	1	2	3	____
Noisy aeroplanes	1	2	3	____
Other (specify)	1	2	3	____

____

30. (CARD A) All things considered, how satisfied are you with this neighbourhood as a place to live? Which number comes closest to how satisfied you feel?

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	____

IF R HAS A FAMILY, ASK Q.31: OTHERWISE GO TO Q.33.

31. Do you feel there are sufficient places for your child(ren) to play in this neighbourhood?

Yes ________

No ________

PLEASE LEAVE
BLANK

32. Do you feel there should be an organized after-school program:

For children up to and including Grade 8

Yes ________ [✓ No ________] ____

For teenagers, Grade 9 and up

Yes ________ No ________ ____

33. (CARD G) How happy are you about your personal safety in this neighbourhood?

Very Unhappy Very Happy DK NA

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ____

"Now I'd like to ask about your neighbours".

34. How many of the adults in this neighbourhood would you know by name if you met them on the street?

Response

All of them 1

Almost all 2

More than half 3

About half 4

Less than half 5

Almost none 6

None .... 7 ____

35. How often do you get together with any of these neighbours just for a chat?

Response

Daily or almost every day 1

1 - 3 times a week 2

1 - 3 times a month 3

Less than once a month 4

Never .... 5 ____

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

36. How often do you get together with your neighbours for organized activities of any kind?

Response

Daily or almost every day 1

1 - 3 times a week 2

1 - 3 times a month 3

Less than once a month 4

Never 5

____

37. How many times in the last twelve months have you been called upon to help a neighbour in an emergency?

Number _______

____

38. How many times in the last twelve months has a neighbour helped you in an emergency?

Number _________

____

39. Are you living too close or too far from your neighbours? (DISTANCE)

Response

Too close 1

Too far away 2

About right 3

DK 8

NA 9

____

"Now I'd like to ask you about your friends".

40. About how many adults do you count as friends?

Number _______

____

41. What proportion of your friends do you count as your best friends? (FRACTION OR PERCENTAGE)

_________________ %

____

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

42. Of your best friends, what proportion are related to you?

_____________%

43. Of your best friends, what proportion are neighbours?

_____________%

44. How often do you get together for organized activities of any kind:

Response

Daily or almost every day ... 1

1 - 3 times a week 2

1 - 3 times a month 3

Less than once a month 4

Never 5

45. How often do you spend a social evening with friends, either in your home or their home, who live outside the neighbourhood?

Response

Daily or almost every day ... 1

1 - 3 times a week 2

1 - 3 times a month 3

Less than once a month 4

Never 5

Don't know ..8

No answer....9

46. How often do you see or speak to your best friends?

Response

Daily or almost every day ... 1

1 - 3 times a week 2

1 - 3 times a month 3

Less than once a month 4

Never 5

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

47. Do you feel you have too many friends or not enough?

Too many ... 1 Not enough ... 2 Just right ... 3

DK .... 8 NA 9

____

48. How many times in the last twelve months have you been called upon to help a friend in an emergency?

Number _______

____

49. How many times in the last twelve months has a friend helped you in an emergency?

Number ________

____

50. How many of your friends live in Leduc?

Number _______

____

51. Are you happy with the number of friends that you have?

Yes ..... 1 No ..... 2 DK ..... 8 NA 9

____

52. How often do you spend a social evening with relatives?

Response

Daily or almost every day 1

1 - 3 times a week 2

1 - 3 times a month 3

Less than once a month 4

Never 5

No answer 9

____

53. How many times in the last twelve months have you been called upon to help a relative in an emergency?

Number ____________

____

54. How many times in the last twelve months has a relative helped you in an emergency?

Number ________

____

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

55. How often do you go out for entertainment, like movies, night clubs, sports events, plays, concerts, etc.?

Response

Daily or almost every day 1

1 - 3 times a week 2

1 - 3 times a month 3

Less than once a month 4

Never 5

DK 8

NA 9

____

56. (CARD A) All things considered, how satisfied are you with the recreational facilities available to you in Leduc?

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

____

57. How often do you and your family use existing recreational facilities in Leduc?

Response

Daily or almost every day 1

1 - 3 times a week 2

1 - 3 times a month 3

Less than once a month 4

DK 8

NA 9

____

58. Which facilities do you and your family use most?

List: ____________________ 1

____________________ 2

____________________ 3

____________________ 4

None ________________ 0

____

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

59. (CARD H) How convenient is it to get to recreational facilities in Leduc?

Convenient						Not convenient	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

___

60. What type of recreational facilities do you (and your family) use on a regular basis outside Leduc?

None ________________ 0

List ____ 1

____ 2

____ 3

___

61. Do you approve or disapprove of the location of the new recreational facilities in Leduc?

Approve 1 Disapprove 2 O.K. 3 Where is it? 4

DK 8 NA 9

___

62. What additional recreational facilities do you feel are needed in Leduc?

None ________________ 0

List ________________________________ 1

________________________________ 2

___

IF YES, ASK:

63. Who do you think should pay for it?

____

____

___

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

"Now I have a few questions about how happy you are with different parts of your life".

64. (CARD G) For each area of life I am going to name, tell me the number that shows how happy you are with that area.

A. Your non-working activities -- hobbies and so on.

Very unhappy Very happy DK NA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

B. Your family life.

Very unhappy Very happy DK NA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

C. Your health and physical condition.

Very unhappy Very happy DK NA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

D. The amount of time you have for doing things you want to do

Very unhappy Very happy DK NA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

E. Your friendships.

Very unhappy Very happy DK NA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

F. Your standard of living -- the things you have like housing, car, furniture, recreation and the like.

Very unhappy Very happy DK NA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

G. All in all, how satisfied with life are you these days?

Very unhappy Very happy DK NA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

65. In general, do you find life exciting, pretty routine, or dull?

Exciting	1
Routine	4
Dull	7
No opinion	8
No answer	9

"Now some questions about employment".

66. Last week, were you working full time, part time, going to school, keeping house, or what?

(CIRCLE ONE CODE ONLY IF MORE THAN ONE RESPONSE, GIVE PREFERENCE TO SMALLEST CODE THAT APPLIES)

Response	
Working full time	1
Working part time	2
With a job, but not at work because of temporary illness, vacation, strike	3
Unemployed, laid off, looking for work	4
Retired	5
In school	6
Keeping house	7
Other (specify)	8

Other ______________________________

IF APPROPRIATE (1-4 ABOVE).

67. What kind of work (do/did)you normally do? (Probe)

Occupation: ______________________________

68. What kind of place (do/did) you work for?

Industry: ______________________________

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

69. Where (Location)? ____________________

70. For what period of time does your job require you to be absent from home?

Work at home ________

Daily ________

Less than 1 week at a time ________

Number of weeks at a time ________

ASK ONLY IF R IS MARRIED OR LIVING IN A COMMON-LAW RELATIONSHIP: OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q. 76.

71. Last week was your spouse working full time?

Response	
Working full time	1
Working part time	2
With a job, but not at work because of temporary illness, vacation, strike	3
Unemployed, laid off, looking for work	4
Retired	5
In school	6
Keeping house	7
Other (specify)	8
Not applicable	0

Other ____________________

72. What kind of work does your spouse do?

Occupation: ____________________

73. What kind of place (does/did) (he/she) work for?

Industry: ____________________

74. Where (Location)? ____________________

PLEASE LEAVE
BLANK

75. For what period of time does your spouse's job require him/her to be absent from home?

Work at home ________

Daily ____________

Less than 1 week at a time _________

Number of weeks at a time __________

76. (CARD A) All things considered, how satisfied are you with your job? (Which number comes closest to how satisfied or dissatisfied you feel?)

Very Dissatisfied					Very Satisfied		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

7

ASK Q'S 77 - 79 ONLY IF R IS CURRENTLY MARRIED OR LIVING IN A COMMON-LAW RELATIONSHIP: OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q. 80

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

77. (CARD C) Please use the numbers on the card to tell me how you and your spouse share the following tasks:

A. Earning the family income.

Husband Entirely	Husband More	Share Equally	Wife More	Wife Entirely	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

____

B. Housekeeping.

Husband Entirely	Husband More	Share Equally	Wife More	Wife Entirely	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

____

C. Keeping in touch with relatives.

Husband Entirely	Husband More	Share Equally	Wife More	Wife Entirely	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

D. Organizing family recreation.

Husband Entirely	Husband More	Share Equally	Wife More	Wife Entirely	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

____

E. Taking care of preschool children. (younger than 5)

Husband Entirely	Husband More	Share Equally	Wife More	Wife Entirely	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

____

F. Teaching, helping and disciplining girls, aged 6 - 12

Husband Entirely	Husband More	Share Equally	Wife More	Wife Entirely	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

____

G. Teaching, helping and disciplining boys, aged 6 - 12

Husband Entirely	Husband More	Share Equally	Wife More	Wife Entirely	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

____

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

78. (CARD G) All things considered, how happy are you with your marriage?

Very unhappy						Very happy	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

IF R HAS CHILDREN

79. Do you feel that your marriage has improved since you had children?

Yes__________ No __________ DK __________ NA __________

80. Are you in contact with any of your relatives?

Yes ________________

No (GO TO Q. 82) __________

81. In the past two years or so, have you received any of the following kinds of help from your RELATIVES. Yes or No?

	Yes	No	NA	IA
A. Advice on a decision you had to Make	1	2	9	0
B. Help on special occasions, such as childbirth, sickness	1	2	9	0
C. Help in caring for your children, such as babysitting	1	2	9	0
D. Financial assistance, such as money or a loan	1	2	9	0
E. Gifts, other than birthdays, Christmas, etc.	1	2	9	0
F. Home repairs, moving, odd jobs, etc.	1	2	9	0
G. Finding a job	1	2	9	0

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

82. Finally, we would like to know something about the groups and organizations to which you belong. Could you name them? (PROBE)

1. ______
2. ______
3. ______
4. ______
5. ______

83. Which ones are in Leduc?

No. 1 2 3 4 5

84. Are you involved in volunteer work of any kind?

Yes ______

No ______ If R over 65, GO TO Q. 89.; If not, GO TO Q. 91

NA ______ If R over 65, GO TO Q. 89.; If not, GO TO Q. 91

IF YES

85. What is it you do?

list ______

86. How many hours per month does it involve?

number ______

87. Is the volunteer work you do connected to childrens' sports or school activities?

Yes ______

No ______

NA ______

88. (CARD G) How happy are you with this experience in volunteer work?

Very happy						Very unhappy	DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

IF R. OVER 65, ASK Q. 89. IF NOT, GO TO Q. 91.

89. How many times have you used Telford House in the past twelve months?

Number ____________

DK _________

NA ____________

90. Would you use it more often if transportation was provided?

Yes _________

No ___________

DK _________

91. Have you ever used federal, provincial or local government services of any kind?

Federal	Yes _______	Provincial	Yes ______	Local	Yes ______
	No ________		No _______		No _______
	DK ________		DK _________		DK _______
	NA ________		NA _________		NA _______

IF YES, CONTINUE Q. 92. IF NO, DK, OR NA GO TO Q. 95.

92. Was that since you were living in Leduc or before?

Since __________ Before __________ Other __________

93. (CARD G) How happy were you with that experience?

Very unhappy					Very happy		DK	NA
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

94. Were the services you used social services or other types?

Social services _____________________ Other ____________

DK ______________

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

95. Have you ever heard or Preventive Social Services?

Yes ________ No ________ DK ________ NA ________ ____

96. Are there any facilities missing from Leduc that you feel it should have?

Yes ________
No ____________ Go TO Q. 99
DK ____________ Go TO Q. 99
NA ____________ Go TO Q. 99 ____

97. What are they?

____
____ ____

98. Would you be prepared to accept an increase in personal, sales or municipal taxes to support that addition?

Yes ________
No ________
DK ________
NA ________ ____

IF RESPONDENT HAS CHILDREN 0 - 12 YEARS, ASK Q. 99. IF NOT, GO TO Q. 108

99. Do you use some kind of baby-sitting or child-care service on a regular basis?

Yes ________
No ________ GO TO Q. 103.
Other ______________________________ ____

100. What type of full-time or part-time service do you use?
Is that paid or unpaid?

	FULL	PART-TIME	PLEASE LEAVE BLANK
Relative comes to own home	______	______	______
Unpaid private sitter to own home	______	______	______
Paid private sitter to own home	______	______	______
Takes child(ren) to relative	______	______	______
Takes child(ren) to paid sitter	______	______	______
Takes child(ren) to paid sitter who takes 1-4 other children	______	______	______
Takes child(ren) to paid sitter who takes 5 or more children	______	______	______
Takes child(ren) to Day Care Home	______	______	______
Takes child(ren) to Day Care Centre	______	______	______
Takes child(ren) to Tiny Tots	______	______	______
Other (explain) ______________________________			______

101. For what reason do you use this service?

Full-time employment ______________

Part-time employment ______________

Housework or shopping ______________

Other projects ______________

Volunteer work ______________

Social ______________

Other (explain) ______________________________ ______

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

102. How many times have you changed your baby-sitting or child-care service in the past twelve months?

Number ________

103. Do you baby-sit or child-sit on a regular basis, paid or Unpaid?

Paid ________

Unpaid ________

Neither ________

104. Do you need a baby-sitting or child care service full time or part-time (part-time: less than 6 hours per day)?

Full time ________

Part time ________

Neither ________

105. Would you use such a service if you could get full time or part-time employment?

Full time: Yes ________

Part time: Yes ________

No ________

106. If you had your choice, what kind of baby-sitting or child care service would you prefer? DO NOT PROMPT

Day Care Home ________

Day Care Centre ________

Private ________

Relative ________ Other ________

107. Would you use a baby-sitting or child care service while you went shopping

Downtown	Yes	________	No	________	DK	________
Coop	Yes	________	No	________	DK	________
Safeway	Yes	________	No	________	DK	________

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

"NOW A COUPLE OF GENERAL QUESTIONS"

108. How many transportation vehicles (not recreation) do you own or lease?

Number ________

109. Would you use a Minibus service within Leduc? e.g. Leduc Estates, Caledonia, South Park, Corinthia.

Yes ________ No ________ DK ________

110. What is your best source of information for finding out what is going on in Leduc?

Word of mouth ________ Radio ________

Newspaper ________ TV ________

Other ________

111. We have mentioned several aspects of your life such as home, family, neighbourhood, standard of living, etc. which contribute to your happiness, which ones do you consider contribute most?

List ________

____

____

112. Which aspects of your life do you feel could be improved to make you happier? (RANK 1, 2, 3 etc.)

List ________ 1

________ 2

________ 3

113. Who do you feel could help most in making that improvement? (List 1, 2, 3 etc.)

Self ______ Spouse ______ Family ______ Neighbours ______

Local organization ______ Local govt. ______

Provincial Govt. ______ Federal Govt. ______

Other (specify) ________

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

IF GOVERNMENT OR Local Organization MENTIONED ASK Q. 114.

114. Do you feel that that improvement would be worth a moderate increase in personal, sales or municipal taxes?

Yes ____________

No ____________

DK ____________

NA ____________

115. Now we would like to know something about the kinds of things you like to do. Please tell me how often you generally get involved with these things:

	Never	Sometimes	Often
a) indoor hobbies like knitting or sewing ..			
b) Outdoor hobbies like gardening			
c) Watching T.V.			
d) Reading (newspapers, books)			
e) Going to movies			
f) Drawing or painting			
g) Playing cards or other table games			
h) Going to the park or the zoo			
i) Going to special lectures or classes ...			
j) Going to sports events			
k) Going to plays or concerts			
l) Participate actively in formal organizations			
m) Participate actively in volunteer work ..			
n) Workshop activities			
o) Going out to visit			
p) Having a few people in to visit			
q) Listen to the stereo or radio			
r) Going for walks or drives in the car ...			

(continued)

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

7

115. Continued

	Never	Some-times	Often
s) Cooking outside			
t) Going for picnics			
u) Going fishing, hunting or camping			
v) Having large parties			
w) Sunbathing			
x) Going to church			
y) Other			

"Now some questions about finances".

116. Would you say that you (and your family) are better off or worse off financially than you were a year ago?

Response

Better now 1

Same 2

Worse 3

Don't know 8

117. Now looking ahead -- do you think that a year from now you (and your family) will be better off financially, or worse off or just about the same as now?

Response

Will be better off 1

Same 2

Will be worse off 3

Don't know 8

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

118. (CARD F) Would you please tell me the letter on this card which best represents your total family income for 1976, before taxes?

Response

A.	Under $2,000	01
B.	$2,000. - $2,999.	02
C.	$3,000 - $3,999.	03
D.	$4,000. - $4,999.	04
E.	$5,000. - $5,999.	05
F.	$6,000. - $6,999.	06
G.	$7,000. - $7,999.	07
H.	$8,000. - $9,999.	08
I.	$10,000. - $11,999.	09
J.	$12,000. - $14,999.	10
K.	$15,000. - $17,499.	11
L.	$17,500. - $19,999.	12
M.	$20,000. - $22,499.	13
N.	$22,500. - $24,999.	14
O.	$25,000. - $29,999.	15
P.	$30,000. - $34,999.	16
Q.	$35,000. and over	17
	Don't know	88
	No answer	99

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

119. (REFER R TO RESPONSE SHEET) Here is a sheet which we would like you to fill out to describe Leduc as it appears to you. For example, if you think Leduc is especially attractive, please put an "X" in the box next to the word "attractive". If you think it is especially unattractive, please put an "X" next to "unattractive", and if you think it is somewhere in between, please put an "X" in the box where you think it belongs.

ATTRACTIVE	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	UNATTRACTIVE	___
UNFRIENDLY PEOPLE	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	FRIENDLY PEOPLE	___
CROWDED	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	UNCROWDED	___
VERY GOOD PLACE TO LIVE	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	VERY POOR PLACE TO LIVE	___
PLEASANT	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	UNPLEASANT	___
BIG CITY	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	RURAL	___
NOTHING TO DO	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	LOTS OF THINGS TO DO	___
HARD TO GET AROUND IN	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	EASY TO GET AROUND IN	___
GOOD PLACE TO RAISE CHILDREN	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	BAD PLACE TO RAISE CHILDREN	___
SAFE	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	UNSAFE	___
POOR CLIMATE	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	GOOD CLIMATE	___
CLEAN AIR	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	DIRTY AIR	___
NOISY	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	QUIET	___

TO BE COMPLETED BY INTERVIEWER

PLEASE LEAVE BLANK

1. Housing type:

Single House	1
Semi detached	2
Duplex	3
Row House	4
Apartment or Multiple Dwelling	5
House attached to a Non-residential structure	6
Mobile Home	7
Other (specify)	8

2. Respondents Cooperation:

Cooperative	1
Indifferent	2
Uncooperative	3

3. Quality of Interview:

High Quality	1
Adequate	2
Questionable	3

4. Comments of Interviewer:

ATTRACTIVE								UNATTRACTIVE
UNFRIENDLY PEOPLE								FRIENDLY PEOPLE
CROWDED								UNCROWDED
VERY GOOD PLACE TO LIVE								VERY POOR PLACE TO LIVE
PLEASANT								UNPLEASANT
BIG CITY								RURAL
NOTHING TO DO								LOTS OF THINGS TO DO
HARD TO GET AROUND IN								EASY TO GET AROUND IN
GOOD PLACE TO RAISE CHILDREN								BAD PLACE TO RAISE CHILDREN
SAFE								UNSAFE
POOR CLIMATE								GOOD CLIMATE
CLEAN AIR								DIRTY AIR
NOISY								QUIET